

THEOLOGICAL
QUARTERLY.

Published by the
Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and other States.

VOLUME I.



St. Louis:
CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE.
1897.

20880

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. I.

JANUARY 1897.

No. 1.

Doctrinal Theology.

WHAT IS THEOLOGY?

Theology has been variously defined; and it is but a matter of course that definitions should differ when the ideas or notions to be defined are not identical. The definition of a science can not cover the idea of an art, and a definition of either can not define what is neither. Thus also certain modern definitions of theology can not consistently agree with ours, since modern scientific theology is not our theology.

There is still another reason why we cannot accept certain modern definitions of theology. A definition may be termed relatively true when it truly exhibits the marks of the object to be defined, even though that object be a perversion of what it should properly be. But when Luthardt defines Theology as "the churchly science of Christianity," this definition is not a true definition even of Luthardt's theology. This theology may be a *science*; but it is certainly not a *churchly* science, being neither of the church, nor by the church, nor for the church, nor in harmony with any church on earth or in heaven. The church as such cannot countenance a theology which ought not to be what it is and is not what it professes to be.

The claim which is most strenuously advanced and most jealously vindicated in behalf of modern theology is that of its *scientific* character and dignity. Even the Roman pontiff falls in line with the time, at least in his language, when in his Encyclical of Aug. 4, 1879, he says: "The perpetual and manifold use of philosophy is required, in order that sacred Theology may obtain the nature, character, and spirit of a true science."¹) That theology should strictly and consistently occupy the standpoint of revelation is met by the objection that "Theology in this form could not lay claim to being scientific."²) It is said to be the duty of theology "to secure for itself recognition and consideration by a character homogeneous with that of the rest of the sciences,"³) and the task of the churches, "to engender in their midst a theology of equal birth with the rest of the academic sciences and entitled to demand at the hands of these the recognition of a science."⁴) So imperative is this demand considered, that it is rendered normative for the determination of the very first fundamental principle of theology. "It will be most to the purpose," says Raebiger, "to determine the relation to revelation into which theology must enter if it would be a science in the true sense of the word and claim to be recognized as such."⁵)

But what modern theology boasts as its strength and excellence, we deplore as its weakness and shortcoming. If the German theologian holds that theology must sustain a scientific character, since, by abandoning its place among the sciences, theology would waive its claims for equal recognition in the universities, we do not hesitate to say that the sooner those claims were relinquished, the better for theology and all therein concerned. Theology is not a sister-

1) Perpetuus et multiplex requiritur philosophiae usus, ut sacra Theologia naturam, habitum, ingeniumque verae scientiae suscipiat atque induat. *Encycl. Aeterni Patris*.

2) Raebiger, *Theologic*, p. 121.

3) *Ibid*.

4) *Ibid*. p. 205.

5) *Ibid*. p. 121.

science with Philosophy, Medicine, and Law, and that she should appear in a quadriga with these sciences is more unsightly than what Moses prohibited saying, "Thou shalt not plow with an ox and an ass together."¹) Even crowning Theology the queen of sciences would be inflicting upon her an honor to which she should not stoop, a degradation and deportation against which she must protest. Being *sui generis*, she is just as much out of place at the head of the class as at the foot of the class.

The unnatural yoking-together of theology with the sciences in the universities was and is in a measure due to abnormal circumstances and conditions in church and state. Paris, the mother and model of mediaeval universities, was at first not an *universitas literarum*, but a school of Theology, as Salerno was a school of Medicine, and Bologna, a school of Law. But being under the sway of the Roman Pontiff wielding the two swords over church and state, and of princes dealing in secular and spiritual investitures, the Doctors very naturally learned to represent the realm of letters, theology and philosophy in the same literary commonwealths, while the church, which should have been the foster-mother of Theology, was held in thralldom by both popes and princes, unmindful of the care of her interests and the management of her affairs. Nor did the church of the Reformation in Germany ever enjoy the good fortune of being constituted as an independent organism in the free exercise of its proper functions, of which the training of theologians for the pulpit and the chair should have ranked among the foremost. The princes, serving as "emergency-bishops" in Luther's days under the stress of papistic hostilities and the incapacity of the people, were also the chief patrons of the universities, and by and by they saw less reason for dissolving than for continuing and confirming the union in which theology was bound up at the high-

1) Deuter. 22, 10.

seats of learning. For the time came when the princes had learned to make the interests of the church subservient to their own political interests, when they claimed as by divine right what pressing necessity under abnormal circumstances had forced upon their fathers. And thus it was that the church became part and parcel of the political machinery, much to the detriment of the church, and Theology remained where it was, much to the detriment of Theology.

More eminently disastrous its being bundled up with the academic sciences has proved to theology because of the importance attached to the universities as scientific workshops rather than professional schools. It has in our day been flatly denied that the university is a school at all. The Professor is not so much a teacher and educator as a man of science occupied in original research, investigation, or speculation, for the advancement or reconstruction of the science he represents. It is, therefore, incumbent upon the man of science to avoid the beaten paths, unless it be with a critical eye and the purpose of scoring up against his predecessors or contemporaries the errors they have committed. Not profound learning and the ability to transmit useful knowledge to hosts of disciples, but to have enriched his science by some new revolutionizing discovery, and to have exploded beyond recovery all the theories at variance with his own, is the true boast of the holder of an academic chair. And here, then, was Theology, side by side with the sciences and represented by one of the four Faculties, in the struggle for academic existence, the Professor of theology in the race with other Professors of Theology, the Professor Ordinarius vying with the Professor Extraordinarius, and both with the Licentiatus Privatim Docens, and all the Theologians with the men of the Philosophical Faculty. Can it be surprising to see Theology stalking along in scientific trappings, preparing to fight Goliath in King Saul's armor, the scientific theologian,

with an emphasis on *scientific*, scanning the horizon in a scientific attitude and with scientific apparatus, bent on discovering some new ruling principle wherewith he might construct a new dogmatic system, a new hypothesis wherewith he might carry on his experiments in higher criticism on a scientific plan and along lines followed by no one before him? It may be safely said that such men as Hofmann, Thomasius, Zetzschwitz, Delitzsch, Kahnis, all of whom had seen better days, would probably never have drifted away so far from their Lutheran moorings, if the academic atmosphere had not furnished the wind to their sails and scientific ambition had not stood at the helm of their theology.

And whither has this theology drifted? An inspiration which is not the inspiration of the Bible; a word of God which is not the *word* of God nor the word of *God*; a God who is not the God of his word; a Trinity which is not a Unity; a Son who is not *the* Son, begotten of the Father from eternity, very God of very God; a Christ who is not *the* Christ, the son of God made of a woman; a Redemption which cannot redeem for want of a Redeemer, God in Christ reconciling the world unto himself; a salvation by grace which is not by grace—such are some of the achievements of scientific theology.

Just how *scientific* such inconsistencies and contradictions as a monotheism with a God in the highest sense of the term and two divine persons of a subordinate type of divinity—which is in fact a tritheistic monotheism—and similar incongruities of modern theology may be, we will not here investigate. What interests us more is, how *theological* this theology is. When Charles Darwin wrote his fundamental work on “The Origin of Species,” he pointed out a multitude of things concerning species; but what he utterly failed to show was the *origin* of species. Modern scientific theology fares even worse. It is either anthropocentric with a pelagianizing anthropology, or theocentric

with a sabellianizing theology, or Christocentric with a nestorianizing or eutychianizing or arianizing Christology, thus embodying heretical elements long ago condemned by the church in the very principles from which it endeavors to develop its systems. These systems do not only fail to make good what they propose and promise, but actually leaven the whole lump of their theology with their adulterated principles. Mediaeval scholasticism was eclectic, a conglomerate of scriptural, papistical, pagan, Jewish and Mohammedan material massed together in systems resembling certain edifices of the Constantinian and post-Constantinian age, with columns and friezes and sculptures appropriated from the temples and basilicas and bath-houses of pagan architecture, and material quarried for the Christian builder at home and abroad. Modern scholasticism is a web of the spider's own making, spun from its own body, the threads symmetrically arranged from center to border, but of no use in the world save to spider itself and its progeny. The systems of these latter-day schoolmen are like so many polar expeditions, planned on more or less scientific principles and equipped with all manner of nautical and astronomical apparatus, all of them making a record of their exploits and entailing labor and expense, but all of them failing in one thing, the achievement of their ultimate purpose, the discovery of the Pole.

Our theology is *not* a science in the modern sense of the term. Christian theology, or, which is the same, Lutheran theology, considered in concreto, is *an aptitude of the mind, comprising the knowledge and acceptance of divine truth and the ability to instruct others toward such knowledge and acceptance, and to defend such truth against its adversaries.* This definition is not of our own contrivance; neither is it ultimately obtained from our earlier dogmaticians; but it is derived from the source of all true theology, the holy Scriptures. Saint Luke gives us the essentials of a theologian in his description and narrative of Apollos,

when he writes: "*And a certain Jew named Apollos, born at Alexandria, an eloquent man, and mighty in the Scriptures, came to Ephesus. This man was instructed in the way of the Lord; and being fervent in the spirit, he spake and taught diligently the things of the Lord, knowing only the baptism of John. And he began to speak boldly in the synagogue. Whom when Aquila and Priscilla had heard, they took him unto them, and expounded unto him the way of God more perfectly. And when he was disposed to pass into Achaja, the brethren wrote, exhorting the disciples to receive him. Who when he was come, helped them much which had believed through grace. For he mightily convinced the Jews, and that publicly, shewing by the Scriptures that Jesus was Christ.*"¹⁾ This man, then, was endowed with a *knowledge of divine truth*, being "instructed in the way of the Lord," and "mighty in the Scriptures," and having "the way of God expounded to him more perfectly." But that truth had not entered into his intellect only, but had been *accepted* by him with a willing heart and had set him aglow with the holy fire of faith and spiritual zeal, making him "fervent in the spirit." He was, furthermore, endowed with *ability to instruct others toward the knowledge and acceptance* of the truth of God; he "spake and taught diligently," not his own wisdom, but "the things of the Lord," and thus "helped them much which had believed through grace." And that not only by teaching the truth, but also inasmuch as he "mightily convinced the Jews," not by philosophical argument, but "showing by the Scriptures that Jesus was Christ," thus *defending the truth of God against its adversaries*. Again, St. Paul describes a theologian as "*holding fast the faithful word as he hath been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers.*"²⁾ Here we have in brief the essentials of our definition. The

1) Acts 18, 24—28.

2) Tit. 1, 9.

theologian "has been taught," and thus imbued with *knowledge*, not of a scientific system, but of "the faithful word," the word of God, which is of divine authority and reliability. And he "holds fast" this faithful word, having *accepted* its truth in firm and confiding faith. He is furthermore, "able by sound doctrine to exhort" and "to convince the gainsayers," or, with our definition, to *instruct* others toward the knowledge and acceptance of God's truth, and to *defend* such truth against its adversaries. And this is the description of all those grand primeval theologians of New Testament Christianity, the apostles of Christ. Having been instructed during a triennium in theology by their Master, they were "guided into all truth by the Spirit of truth."¹⁾ They had not only acquired an intellectual knowledge of the truth, but had accepted such truth as truly divine and placed their confidence in it, as Christ says, "They have *known* that all things, whatsoever thou hast given me, *are of thee*; for I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me; and *they have received them*, and have known surely that I came out from thee, and they have *believed* that thou didst send me."²⁾ So do the Acts of the Apostles, and their epistles, and millions in all ages who "believed on Christ through their word,"³⁾ bear witness to their aptness to instruct others toward the knowledge and acceptance of the truth of God and to defend that truth against all manner of assailants even to the present day and to the end of time.

On the other hand, if weighed in the balance of modern theology, all of the "holy men of God" must be found wanting; not one of them can aspire to the dignity of a theologian. In the writings of neither Paul, nor Peter, nor John, do we find an exhibition of the "scientific self-consciousness of the church." Their doctrinal theology is not "developed," or, as Luthardt's professes to be, "repro-

1) John 16, 13.

2) John 17, 7. 8.

3) John 17, 20.

duced from the religious faith of the Christian.”¹⁾ Paul speaks in words which the Holy Ghost teacheth;²⁾ his preaching is “by the word of God,”³⁾ for “the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God.”⁴⁾ Thus also St. Peter would have us take heed not to the self-consciousness of the church, nor to his own self-consciousness, though he had been an eye-witness of the revelation of Christ in Glory, but unto the “more sure word of prophecy, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place.”⁵⁾ And what St. John “declares” unto the churches is “the message which he has heard of Christ,”⁶⁾ not the “science of religion,” not the “self-consciousness of the church.” Neither may Luther, the greatest theologian of post-apostolic times, pass muster under the censorship of modern theology. He says: “In theology . . . the beginning is this, and this only, that you hear and believe the word of God. He who will not begin thus will fail and achieve nothing nor preach right, though he had all the world’s wisdom . . . And once more, no one who would do what is meet and right should teach or preach of himself; but he should treat of God’s word, and nothing else.”⁷⁾ Luther too, then, is profoundly ignorant of a theology which “must genetically develop the whole of Christian doctrine from a fundamental unit.”⁸⁾ He says, “He who is well versed and founded in the *text* will be a good and accomplished theologian.”⁹⁾

Second in rank among the theologians of our church is Martin Chemnitz, the “alter Martinus.” But he too must surrender his commission under the new regime. In his *Enchiridion* he proposes the question: “What doctrine or word is a preacher to exhibit to the church?” and his answer is: “He is not to preach his dreams or the thoughts

1) Compendium der Dogmatik, § 5.

3) Rom. 10, 17.

5) 2 Pet. 1, 19.

7) Works, Erl. ed. 48, 147. 148.

9) Erl. 57, 7.

2) 1 Cor. 2, 10.

4) 1 Cor. 2, 11.

6) 1 John 1, 5.

8) Luthardt *ibid.* § 12, 1.

and opinions of his own heart, Jer. 23; neither should he preach doctrines or traditions of men, Is. 29. Mat. 15; but if any man speak in the church of God, let him speak as the oracles of God, 1 Pet. 4.”¹⁾ He furthermore asks: “Where have we and do we find such word of God?” and answers: “God has at sundry times and in divers manners revealed his word, has himself appeared, has moved holy men by his Spirit and inspired unto them his word and spoken through their mouths. Lastly he has spoken through Christ and his Apostles. Heb. 1. 2 Pet. 1. 2 Tim. 3. Luc. 1.”²⁾—And having next asked the question: “Is, then, all that it behooves us to know of God’s word contained in the Scriptures?” his answer is, “Christ says, John 15, ‘All things that I have heard of my Father, I have made known unto you, my Apostles;’ and Paul, an Apostle, says Acts 20, ‘I have not shunned to declare unto you all the council of God.’ Therefore beyond this the Holy Ghost will not reveal any other or new thing through the prelates or councils; for his office is to bring all things to our remembrance, whatsoever Christ has taught. John 14. And although not all the miracles and sermons of the Prophets, of Christ, and of the Apostles, are in detail described, yet the H. Spirit has encompassed in holy writ the sum and substance of the entire doctrine whereof the Church is in need unto faith, whereby eternal life may and must be obtained. John 20, and St. Paul, 2 Tim. 3, attributes to the holy Scriptures two things, the *first*, that it makes a man of God, that is, a preacher and teacher, so perfect that he is thoroughly furnished unto all good works pertaining to the ministry; the *second*, that the holy Scriptures are able to make every Christian wise unto salvation. And as in the Scriptures we have all we need unto eternal life and salvation, it is meet and right that we should not de-

1) Chemnitz, Enchiridion, ed. Graebner, p. 30.

2) Ibid. p. 32.

sire to hear and know anything beside and beyond this in matters of faith.''¹⁾ It thus appears that Chemnitz had in his theology as little use as Luther had for the scientific reproduction of doctrines from the Christian's faith or the self-consciousness of the Church. Their theology was simply scriptural, as was also that of the great theologians of the XVII century, the few flaws in the systems of Gerhard, Calov, Quenstedt, Dannhauer and others being precisely those points in which they suffered themselves to be prompted by certain considerations which had insinuated themselves between the dogmatician's mind and the only legitimate source of Christian doctrine, holy Scripture, the infallible word of God.

Declining, then, in behalf of our orthodox theology the scientific character claimed by modern theology, and asserting simply its scripturalness, we would not, however, be understood to say that our theology is void of plan or principle. We too know of a central or cardinal dogma, that of Justification by grace, for Christ's sake, through faith. But neither has this dogma grown to be what it is by a process of development, nor has "the whole of Christian doctrine been genetically developed" from this doctrine. The central doctrine and the doctrines that radiate about it are all of them found complete in, and taken in all their parts directly from, the written word of God. Neither was the doctrine of Justification made the central doctrine in our theology by theological reasoning, but we give it that place simply because the Scriptures place it there, and it is for this reason that we discountenance the Calvinistic scheme, which awards the central position to the doctrine of the sovereign majesty of God.—We too know of principles in our theology. That the Bible is by verbal inspiration the written word of God, the infallible source and norm of doctrine, is with us a principle so far-reaching that

1) Ibid. p. 32. 33.

its application is perceptible throughout the entire length and breadth of our theology, exegetical, doctrinal, historical, and practical, and distinguishes the orthodox theology of our church from modern scientific theology and all other theologies far more radically and uncompromisingly than homoeopathy and allopathy may differ in and by their principles. But this principle is speculative or constructive neither in its genesis nor in its application, but is itself found whole and complete in the Scriptures and enters into no relation to human reason other than that which enjoins upon reason those *organic* functions which do not add to nor take from or otherwise alter the truth as it is revealed in the written Word. Our theology concedes the dignity of a theological doctrine to no statement which may be derived from a revealed doctrine by a process of reasoning only, but is not itself in all its terms actually taught in holy Scripture. And, again, our theology admits of no elimination or modification of any truth laid down in Scripture because of a seeming incompatibility with some other doctrine also clearly set forth in Scripture. We maintain the doctrines of God's common grace, of Christ's universal redemption, of the general efficacy and resistibility of the means of grace, and conversion by the means of grace thus constituted, because we find these doctrines taught in Scripture. And we likewise maintain the doctrines of man's universal and total depravity and his utter inability to concur in any way or measure toward his conversion, and of the election of the few as being in Christ Jesus a cause of their eternal salvation and everything thereto pertaining, again because we find these doctrines also taught in Scripture, and although there appears to be between them and the doctrines first enumerated a chasm which we can neither fathom nor bridge. We reject as unscriptural and, therefore, untheological, every attempt to reconcile the seemingly incompatible doctrines by modifying or, which is the same, perverting the one or the other. The sub-

stance of every doctrine is a fixed magnitude determined by the texts in which each doctrine is set forth.

Our theology further demands that not only the various theological truths in themselves, but also their relation to each other should be scriptural. Though the various articles of faith may be, *docendi causa*, differently arranged, their internal relation is forever established in revelation, and a change in this relation is a perversion of doctrine. Thus when St. Paul teaches that God has chosen us in Christ,¹⁾ the doctrine of Predestination is thereby shown to presuppose that of Redemption, and not vice versa.

Lastly, our theology, in being scriptural, is also truly *protestant*. Luther struck the key-note of true protestantism and of true theology when he opened the first of his ninety-five theses with the words: "*Our Lord and Master Jesus Christ, saying—*" These words were virtually a Declaration of Independence directed against Antichrist, because they were actually an avowal of allegiance to Christ and of obedience and subjection to his word. But that same allegiance and obedience implied no less decided a protest against the rule of reason in matters of faith and doctrine. Luther was prompted and actuated by the same theology when he refused to recant at Worms and when he refused to yield at Marburg. True liberty is not licentiousness in theology any more than it is in social or political life, and the freedom of thought which true protestantism claims and concedes is freedom to think the thoughts of God revealed in the word of God, human authority of any kind to the contrary notwithstanding. A. G.

1) Eph. 1, 4.

Exegetical Theology.

THE GENESIS OF NEW TESTAMENT GREEK.

The linguistic character of the idiom employed by the Holy Spirit in the New Testament has been a matter of controversy, sharp controversy at times, carried on by individuals in single combat or by entire schools in pitched battles. "The *Purists*," says Stuart, "would allow nothing but pure Attic Greek in it. Their antagonists, the *Hellenists*, after a long and arduous contest, drove them from the field. But not content with this, they pushed their conquest, as victors are very apt to do, far beyond the bounds of sober consideration. The second generation of Hellenists found Hebraisms everywhere. Not only the phraseology and coloring and sentiment of the New Testament were represented as Hebraistic, but the construction and regimen of the great mass of words were deemed to be Hebrew, the meaning and regimen of the particles were Hebrew; the tenses of verbs and the cases of nouns were conformed to the Hebrew; the article was used in the manner of the Hebrew one; and even the syntax was, in innumerable passages, represented as being conformed to the model of the Hebrew. In a word, any difficulty, as to the meaning of a Greek word, or as to its construction, was solved, if possible, by a resort to the usages of the Hebrew language."¹⁾ The language of the Apostles was, on the one hand, wreathed with honors which it declines to share with the language of the rostrum and the stage, and, on the other hand, reviled as a vulgar dialect bristling with barbarisms and solecisms.

It is not here our purpose to investigate in detail the nature of the idiom peculiar to the New Testament, but

1) Grammar of the New Testament Dialect, p. III. IV.

rather to point out certain general laws of language in their bearing upon the formation of this idiom, and to show how in choosing a language, and a certain dialect of that language, and modifying that dialect in adapting it to its special purpose, the Spirit of God has manifested his divine wisdom to the Glory of God and the salvation of man.

The Mosaic record of man's creation very clearly shows that, whatever the language of primeval man may have been, he certainly had and spoke a language;¹⁾ that language is not a product of human invention, gradually established by mutual agreement, nor a product of natural development from a few rudiments, but a concreated endowment of the parents of our race, a gift of God to man, who in this as in all things was the Creator's handiwork. Rational language is, since the very day when man was made, as truly as his rational soul a feature in the specific difference between man and brute.

The book of Genesis further teaches us²⁾ that for a long time the human race spoke one common language, until by divine dispensation a multitude of languages sprung up at the building of the city and tower of Babel. Since then a diversity of languages has existed on earth, and these languages have had their history and have under various circumstances and influences undergone various changes.

But even as the origin of language and the diversity of languages were not the result of arbitrary invention or contrivance of individuals and of subsequent mutual agreement between them and others upon the use of such invention for the purposes of a language, so also the changes through which languages have passed and are still passing have not been brought about merely by the free will of human individuals dictating to or agreeing with other individuals how language should be changed in its substance or structure, but according and pursuant to certain laws and

1) Gen. 2, 19. 20. 24.

2) Gen. 11, 1. 6. 7. 9.

tendencies inherent in the languages themselves and in the rational mind. When the Roman emperor Tiberius upon a time had blundered in his speech, he was at once corrected by the grammarian Marcellus, and when Capito, another grammarian, said, what the emperor had spoken was good Latin or soon would be, Marcellus, less courtier-like, drubbed Capito a liar and thus accosted the emperor: "Thou canst give the Roman citizenship to men, but not to words." Max Mueller, quoting another and similar anecdote of the German emperor Sigismund, relates: When presiding at the Council of Costnitz, he addressed the assembly in a Latin speech, exhorting them to eradicate the schism of the Hussites. "Videte Patres," he said, "ut eradicetis schismam Hussitarum." He was very unceremoniously called to order by a monk, who called out, "Serenissime Rex, schisma est generis neutri." The emperor, however, without losing his presence of mind, asked the impertinent monk, "How do you know it?" The old Bohemian school-master replied, "Alexander Gallus says so." "And who is Alexander Gallus?" the emperor rejoined. The monk replied, "He was a monk." "Well," said the emperor, "and I am Emperor of Rome; and my word, I trust, will be as good as the words of any monk." No doubt the laughs were with the emperor; but for all that, *schisma* remained a neuter, and not even an emperor could change its gender and termination.¹⁾

Yet, on the other hand, it should be noted that language, being a manifestation of the mind, will, generally, in a measure bear the imprint of the individual mind which manifests itself in speech. A rude mind will, as a rule, use rude language; a polished mind, polished language; a peculiar mind, peculiar language. And as one mind exerts an influence upon another mind not by direct, immediate impact, but chiefly by its language, the conformity ensuing

1) Lectures on the Science of Language, ed. Scribner & Co. I Series, p. 47 f.

from such influence will, in some degree, result in a conformity of language. Thus the disciples of a great teacher will more or less adopt their master's peculiarities of speech. And thus it is that when an individual gains a definite and enduring sway over the minds of an entire nation or a great portion thereof, he will correspondingly affect the language of that nation, especially when that influence is exerted through language in the stereotyped form of widely disseminated writings. The German language would not be by far what it is to-day but for the greatest German, Martin Luther; Latin was largely modified by Tertullian and others who made it the language of Latin Christianity, and in our day the introduction of the Christian religion among a people and, especially, the translation of the Bible into its vernacular tongue, will in some measure work a change in the language of that people.

Generally, the changes which languages are apt to undergo run a more rapid course when and where a language is merely the spoken dialect of a tribe or a section of country. It has been observed by an American missionary in Burmah that the language of a tribe which left its native village to settle in another valley became unintelligible to the relatives in two or three generations. But when a nation or tribe gains a supremacy, and its dialect becomes the language of national laws, of a common religion, and of a national literature, it settles down and becomes more stationary. Thus it was with the Latin Language. Latin was originally a dialect of Latium in Italy, and of Rome in Latium, and of the patricians in Rome, one of the many dialects spoken in Italy, and while it was nothing more than one of a sisterhood of dialects, it was subject to great and rapid changes, so that, after it had become the national language of the republic, and fixed by the creators of a Roman literature, the Romans of later days found the greatest difficulty in making out the remnants of their language in an earlier form. Horace confesses that he could

not understand the old Salian poems,¹⁾ and Polybius tells us that in his days the best informed Romans could only with difficulty make out the sense of the ancient treaties between Rome and Carthage. We have even a more striking instance in the German language. The twelfth century gave rise to a rich German literature, bearing such fruits as the epics of the *Nibelunge* and *Gudrun*, the German Iliad and Odyssee, and the lyrics of the Minnesinger. That luxurious spring time was followed by a barren period of several centuries, during which German was nearly exclusively a spoken language in its various dialects, and by the time that a new period of German literature was called forth in the days of the Reformation, the language presented an appearance so different from that of the language of Walther von der Vogelweide, that Middle High German must now be studied by modern Germans like a foreign language with special grammars and dictionaries. New High German, on the contrary, under the curb of its literature, has changed comparatively little in the course of three centuries.

Returning to the Greek language, we find that in early days there was a great diversity of dialects among those who spoke Greek as their mother tongue, the various sections of the country, and even towns and hamlets, having their peculiarities in their words and forms of words. There were not only the greater dialects of which the Dorian was one, but within this dialect we find the *διάλεκτοι τοπικαί*, the local dialects, of the Spartans, the Messenians, the Argives, the Cretans, the Syracusans, and the Tarentinians. A common Greek book-language was adopted in and after the days of Alexander the Great, when Greek became a medium of communication throughout the entire Orient. As a spoken language this common dialect, *κοινή διάλεκτος*, received its peculiar complexion in various countries under the influence of the native languages with which it came into contact.

1) Epp. II, 1, 86.

Thus in Alexandria it was modified by the social climate of that cosmopolitan city, especially by the literary Jews who made it the garb of Old Testament revelation in the Septuagint Version, which was read in the Orient and Occident by Jews and Gentiles.

The mother-tongue of Jesus and the apostles as of the Jews in Palestine in their day was most likely the West-Aramean dialect. The various opinions, according to which Christ had preached in Latin, or had conversed and preached chiefly in the language of the Septuagint, or had lectured to his disciples in Hebrew, have been advocated with more learning than wisdom. The truth is that all these languages were heard in Palestine beside the popular West-Aramean. Latin was spoken at Jerusalem and other military headquarters and seats of Roman officials, as in the residence of Pontius Pilate and in the camp of Emmaus. Hebrew was heard in the schools of Gamaliel and at Tiberias; it was read in the synagogues of Jerusalem and Capernaum, where it was translated to the congregation by interpreters, one verse at a time of the Thora and three verses at a time of Prophets; many prayers and benedictions were said in Hebrew, and the Psalms were recited in the same language. Greek was spoken in the numerous Greek colonies in the northern part of Palestine and in Perea; it was the language of the Herodian court and the homes of the courtiers; the κοινή διάλεκτος was the English of the Hellenistic Jews, who kept up a continual intercourse with the native land of Israel, and many of whom sojourned or dwelled in Jerusalem and other cities of Palestine.¹⁾ And thus it was that while West-Aramean, of which a Judean, a Samaritan, and a Galilean²⁾ idiom were distinguishable, was the vernacular of the people of Palestine, the Greek that was there spoken

1) Acts 2, 8—11. and 6, 1. 7. It appears from the Greek names of the deacons chosen on that occasion that all of them were Hellenists.

2) Mark 14, 70. "Thou art a Galilean, and thy speech agreeth thereto."

and which the Apostles and Evangelists wrote was tinged with Hebrew, Aramean, and, to some extent, with Latin ingredients, as we shall have occasion to show in detail later on. But to maintain that because of this admixture of foreign elements the language of the New Testament must be termed a barbaric idiom, a mongrel dialect, as compared with the Greek of Homer or Aristophanes, is as little consistent with linguistic justice as it would be to degrade the English of Washington Irving or Fennimore Cooper because of certain elements in their vocabulary which are not found in Chaucer or Shakespeare. And, more than that, if the language of the New Testament must be termed degenerate and barbarous because of the occurrence of such words as *μαμωνᾶ* and *πίσχα*, *μὴ τῶν σαββάτων* and *σατανᾶς*, the English language of to-day is by far the most barbarous language spoken by any civilized nation on the face of the earth.

But to say that New Testament Greek is capable of apology, is saying very little. We claim and maintain far more in its behalf.

The language of Old Testament revelation was the peculiar language of a peculiar people, the people which God had chosen from all the nations of the earth, which he had hedged about and in many ways separated from the gentile nations round about them, in whose capital city he had established his sanctuary and worship, types and shadows prefiguring what should come to pass in the fulness of time. But on the other hand, that people was not domiciled in some secluded inland district of darkest Africa, remote from the rest of mankind, but right in the middle of the old world, in the depression of the Mediterranean, where a multitude of nations shared in making the greater part of the world's history, on or near the great thoroughfare of the commercial intercourse of the East and West, near neighbors to the great seafaring people of antiquity, the Phoenicians. That people had in its childhood sojourned in Egypt

and was later on exiled in the Assyrian and the Babylonian captivities, but not to continue there as a transplanted nation, but to return to its ancestral home, there to bide the fulfillment of the prophecies laid down and preserved in the "oracles of God," the preservation of which was one of the chief purposes of the national existence of Israel according to the flesh.¹⁾ Behold the wisdom of God in placing within the reach of many nations while in safe keeping with a peculiar people the Word which testified of the coming Messiah!

But when the fulness of time was come, when the promised Savior of mankind himself had publicly proclaimed, "It is finished!"²⁾ and when the story of the world's redemption and the doctrine of salvation by faith in Christ crucified and the risen Lord was now to be disseminated through the world and handed downward through the ages and to the end of time, when God contemplated the addition of a New Testament to the Old, the language of the new Canon was not to be that of the Jewish people, but that language which was then more than any other the language of the civilized world, which the children of the better classes in the capital city of the world studied and spoke before their mother tongue,³⁾ without a fair knowledge of which no polite education was thought complete, and in which, through the Septuagint version, Moses and the Prophets had for centuries spoken to readers in many lands of the Savior of mankind. And yet it was not the κοινή διάλεκτος as it had come from the pen of Polybius, Plutarch, Strabo, Aelian, Lucian and others, which was to be the Lingua Sacra of the New Testament. Salvation was of the

1) Rom. 3, 2.

2) John 19, 30.

3) Quintilian, Inst. Orator. 1, 1: "A Graeco sermone puerum incipere malo . . . Non tamen hoc adeo superstitiose velim fieri, ut diu tantum loquatur Graece aut discat, *sicut plerisque moris est*;" i. e., I prefer to have the boy begin with the Greek language. . . . But this I would not have observed so scrupulously as to make him for a long time speak or learn Greek only, as is mostly the custom.

Jews, to whom pertained the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises, whose were the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came.¹⁾ From the Jews, also, the records of salvation were to come as by divine inspiration, and the Greek of the New Testament was to bear the stamp and imprint of the country where Jesus lived and died, and of that church and people of which New Testament Christianity is, not in form, but as to its spiritual nature, the true continuation, its adherents living by the same faith in the same Savior as Abraham, their father according to the faith.²⁾ And how this Palestinian Greek was eminently qualified to serve the purpose for which it was chosen, and in what manner it was further modified under divine inspiration, we shall endeavor to show in the continuation of this treatise. A. G.

(To be continued.)

Historical Theology.

CALVIN AND THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION.

In a letter dated March 25, 1557, and directed to Martin Schalling of Ratisbon in reply to an epistle addressed to him by Schalling on February 4 of the same year, Calvin, while he openly and firmly rejects the Lutheran doctrine of the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist, makes the following statement: "*Nor do I repudiate the Augsburg Confession, which in time past I have willingly and cheerfully subscribed according as the author himself has interpreted it.*"³⁾

1) Rom. 9, 4. 5.

2) John 8, 56. Rom. 4, 3. Gal. 3, 6. 7. 29.

3) Nec vero Augustanam confessionem repudio, cui pridem volens ac libens subscripsi, sicuti eam autor ipse interpretatus est. Calvini opera, ed. Baum, Cunitz, Reuss, vol. XVI, p. 430.

From these words it has been inferred that the Augsburg Confession which Calvin subscribed during his stay at Strassburg had been the *Variata*, in which the article on the Lord's Supper had been changed by Melancthon in a manner to permit its being variously understood or interpreted.¹⁾

That this erroneous assumption has obtained very widespread acceptance among the historians of to-day, until it has crept into our handbooks of ecclesiastical history and theological encyclopedias and is traditionally copied and re-copied and carried forward from one edition to another, is the more remarkable, as the comparison of a few dates must incontrovertibly show its incorrectness.

Calvin, having, after his banishment from Geneva in April 1538, spent several months at Basle, arrived at Strassburg early in September and preached his first sermon to the French refugees in that city on Sunday, the 8th of the month. The organization of a congregation of these people was effected under the auspices and with the sanction of the magistrates; the church of St. Nicholas was thrown open to the foreigners, and a small salary was set aside for their preacher. On May 1, 1539, the School-Board, as appears on their minutes, discussed the feasibility of employing Calvin, "who is said to be a learned and pious fellow and to read theology at times," as a lecturer in the Academy, and voted him a continuation of his allowance of 52 florins for his services as an assistant preacher. On the 12th of the same month he had also been employed under a salary to lecture in theology, and opened his public exposition of St. Paul to the Corinthians. Calvin was settling down in

1) Art. X in the original text of the Augsburg Confession reads: "De coena Domini docent, quod corpus et sanguis Domini vere adsint et distribuantur vescentibus in coena Domini, et improbant secus docentes." In the *Variata* the article is: "De coena Domini docent, quod cum pane et vino vere exhibeantur corpus et sanguis Christi vescentibus in coena Domini."

Strassburg. A week after his appointment to the lecturer-ship he was contemplating marriage, and in July he purchased the citizenship. It was customary for men of letters to enter their names in the rolls of some one of the regular trades, and Calvin entered his with the tailors, who had their tavern at the junction of the Muenstergasse and the Horsemarket, where in later times the Scheidecker mansion stood, which was destroyed during the siege of 1870.¹⁾

Thus Calvin had in 1539 become a citizen of Strassburg, then a Lutheran city and commonwealth, all of whose ministers and public teachers were held to subscribe the Augsburg Confession of 1530, and it was when he entered upon the performance of his official duties as a minister and public teacher that Calvin "willingly and cheerfully" signed the Augsburg Confession. It was the confession of 1530 which he thus embraced in 1539. When in October of that year Peter Caroli came to Strassburg to make his peace with the Lutherans, Calvin with Capito, Bucer, Hedio, Zell, Bedrotus, and Sturm, placed his signature under the protocol of the conference held with Caroli, and in this document he and the rest of the signers declare: "First, then, he (Caroli) acknowledges as orthodox the confession of *our* princes submitted to the Emperor at Augsburg;"²⁾ and again: "This *our* confession, submitted to the Emperor at the Diet of Augsburg, testifies."³⁾ Here Calvin expressly and over his own signature acknowledges the Confession of 1530 as *his* Confession. And this Con-

1) The records say: "Iohannes Caluinus hatt das Burgrecht kaufft vnnnd dient zun schneiden. Dt. Zinstag den 29. Iulij Anno etc. 39. Heinrich von Dachstein Rentmeister. Io. Beyer prothonot." And: "Uff den 30. tag Iulij Anno 39 ist Iohannes Caluinus vff vnser Herren der statt Straszburg stall erschinnen vnnnd sich angeben lut der ordnung vnnnd will dienen mit den schnydern."

2) Primum confessionem principum nostrorum Caesari Augustae oblatam agnoscit orthodoxam. Calv. opp. X b, 375.

3) Testis est nostra confessio Caesari in Comitibus Augustanis exhibita. Ibid. p. 392.

fession was not the *Variata*, simply because in 1539, when Calvin "willingly and cheerfully" subscribed the Augsburg Confession and affixed his signature to the 12 articles agreed upon in the conference with Caroli, the *Variata* was not yet in existence. The *Variata* first appeared in 1540, and it was, therefore, simply impossible for Calvin or any other man to sign it or refer to it in 1539.

While it is thus evident that Calvin at Strassburg acknowledged as his own confession the Augustana, not of 1540, but of 1530, we must not on that account consider his statement to Schalling as entirely without foundation in the facts of the case. His words *may*, but *must* not, be understood to say that he had signed the *Variata*, and since the statement, if it were intended to say that he had subscribed the altered, and not the unaltered, Confession, would stand as a downright falsehood, charity demands that we should put a different construction upon the passage and take the author to say that he subscribed the Confession, understanding it in the sense in which Melancthon himself then understood and *afterwards* interpreted it. It can not be said that this construction clears Calvin entirely of the charge of duplicity. The words of the Confession of 1530 are clear, and the tenth Article admits of but one understanding. The corresponding Article in the *Variata* is not an interpretation, but an alteration of the original, if interpretation is finding out or exhibiting "the true sense of any form of words."¹) To mention but one point, simply suppressing the words, "et improbant secus docentes," from the X Article is certainly in no sense an interpretation and in every sense an alteration. And the context of the statement in the letter to Schalling shows that it is precisely the X Article which was in Calvin's mind when he made the statement. And Calvin had been and was then among the "*secus docentes*." In the first edition of his

1) Lieber, Legal and Political Hermeneutics, 3d ed. p. 13.

Institutio, in 1536, he had said: "We thereby say that not the very substance of the body, or the true and natural body of Christ is given there, but all the blessings which Christ bestowed upon us in his body."¹) And when the author of the *Institutio* remembered how extensively and emphatically he had in the first edition of his work argued from the absence of Christ's body against the real presence of that body in the eucharist, he must have known that the substitution of *vere exhibeantur* for *vere adsint et distribuantur* in the Augustana was not an interpretation, but an alteration. But Calvin had at the time when he acknowledged the Confession of 1530 as his own confession been sufficiently acquainted with Melanchthon's changed attitude toward the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's supper to know that the Augustana of 1530 no longer expressed what Melanchthon held concerning the eucharist. And still Melanchthon was considered a Lutheran, and his evil example might serve as an object-lesson to Calvin and encourage him to pose as a Lutheran side by side with such Lutherans as Bucer and Capito, whom to this day reformed historians class among the "Fathers of the Reformed Church." And this all the more, since Calvin had after 1536 changed his language, if not his sense. In 1537, when the transactions of the Wittenberg conference of 1536 had been reported to the Swiss, a number of theologians, assembled at Berne, adopted a declaration, the closing words of which were: "This is none the less true since our Lord, having been raised up to heaven, has withdrawn from us the local presence of his body, which is by no means here required. For although we are, during our pilgrimage through this mortal life, not included or contained in the same place with him, the efficacy of his spirit is not hemmed in by any limits, so that he might not gather in one what is separated by space.

1) Quo scilicet significamus, non substantiam ipsam corporis, seu verum et naturale Christi corpus illic dari: sed omnia, quae in suo corpore nobis beneficia Christus praestitit. Opp. I, 123.

Hence we recognize his spirit to be the bond of our partaking of him, but so that the *substance* of the Lord's flesh and blood truly feeds us unto immortality. But this communion of his flesh and blood Christ offers and exhibits under the symbols of bread and wine in his holy supper to all who duly celebrate it according to his lawful ordinance.¹⁾ A copy of this declaration was submitted to Bucer and Capito and was sanctioned by them in a note over their signatures, stating: "This opinion of our most excellent brethren and fellow-priests G. Farel, John Calvin, and P. Viret, we do embrace as orthodox cet."²⁾ And in his reply to Sadolet, the Cardinal and bishop of Carpentras, who had in an epistle addressed to them exhorted the senate and people of Geneva to return to the Roman Church, Calvin in 1539 wrote: "Christ's presence, whereby we are ingrafted into him, we by no means exclude from the Supper. Neither do we, indeed, obscure it, guarding only against the assumption of local confinement, against the glorious body of Christ being dragged down into earthly elements, against the fiction of transsubstantiation of the bread into Christ to be thereupon adored in lieu of Christ."³⁾

1) Istis nihil repugnat, quod Dominus noster in coelum sublatus, localem corporis sui praesentiam nobis abstulit, quae hic minime exigitur. Nam utcumque nos in hac mortalitate peregrinantes in eodem loco cum ipso non includimur, aut continemur, nullis tamen finibus limitata est ejus spiritus efficacia, quin vere copulare et in unum colligere possit, quae locorum spatiis sunt disiuncta. Ergo spiritum eius vinculum nostrae cum ipso participationis agnoscimus, sed ita ut nos ille carnis et sanguinis Domini *substantia* vere ad immortalitatem pascat. Hanc autem carnis et sanguinis sui communionem Christus sub panis et vini symbolis in sacrosancta sua coena offert et exhibet omnibus qui eam rite celebrant iuxta legitimum eius institutum. Calvini opp. IX, 711.

2) Praesentiam optimorum fratrum et symmystarum nostrorum G. Farelli, Io. Calvini atque P. Vireti, ut orthodoxam amplectimur. *Ibid.* p. 711.

3) Praesentim Christi, qua nos illi inseramur, a coena minime excludimus. Neque vero ipsam obscuramus, modo absit localis circumscriptio, modo ne gloriosum Christi corpus ad terrena elementa detrahatur, modo ne in Christum fingatur panis transsubstantiari, ut deinde pro Christo adoretur. Calv. opp. V, 400.

It was to this tract¹⁾ that Luther referred in his letter of Oct. 14, 1539, to Bucer, saying: "Give my respectful greetings to John Sturm and John Calvin, whose tracts I have read with singular pleasure."²⁾ Calvin highly appreciated this recognition, and in a letter to Farel of Nov. 20, 1539, remarked: "Crato, one of our printers, lately returned from Wittenberg, bringing a letter from Luther to Bucer in which the following was written: 'Give my respectful greetings to Sturm and Calvin, whose tracts I have read with singular pleasure.'"³⁾ The following words are in the autograph manuscript, but canceled: "And now consider what I there say on the eucharist. Think of Luther's magnanimity. One may without difficulty understand what cause those may have who so persistently refuse to unite with him."⁴⁾ Calvin's inclination toward Luther's doctrine in those days further appears from a letter addressed to a certain Andrew Zebedaens, a strenuous Zwinglian, who was ill pleased with Bucer's endeavors toward an agreement with Luther, and whose strictures are met by Calvin in words as these: "There is no reason why you should be so much exasperated at Bucer's retractations. Having erred in his deliveries on the use of the sacraments, it was proper that he should retract that point. Oh that Zwingli, whose opinion in this matter was false and per-

1) Not Calvin's treatise on the Lord's Supper, which was not written before 1540, nor his *Institutio*, as has also been erroneously supposed.

2) Et salutabis D. Iohannem Sturmium et Ioh. Calvinum reverenter, quorum libellos cum singulari voluptate legi. . . . Die Calixti (Oct. 14.) 1539. De Wette V, p. 210.

3) Crato, unus ex calcographis nostris, Witemberga nuper rediit, qui literas attulit a Luthero ad Bucerum in quibus ita scriptum erat: Saluta mihi Sturmium et Calvinum reverenter, quorum libellos singulari voluptate legi. Calv. Opp. X, b, 432.

4) Iam reputa quid illic de eucharistia dicam. Cogita Lutheri ingenuitatem. Facile erit statuere quid causae habeant qui tam pertinaciter ab eo dissident. *Ibid.*

nicious, had prevailed upon himself to do the same!''¹) And in an epistle to one Richard Sylvius of the same year he says: "I would have you understand that I am not willing to take issue with those who hold the true communication of the Lord's body and blood in the Supper, but that I assiduously exhort all those with whom, being in good favor or authority, I can exert my influence, to do what is in their power toward its commendation and elucidation. Never, indeed, have I been pleased with the designs of those who, being too much bent upon overthrowing the superstition of the local presence, either extenuated and thus did away with the merit of the real presence, or by passing it over in silence in a manner effaced it from the minds of men. But there is a middle ground which you may occupy, appearing neither to drift away toward those prodigious rantings of the papists, nor dissembling the true manner of partaking of the flesh of Christ."²)

But withal, while he thus delivered himself during his abode in Germany, Calvin was not a Lutheran. In the second edition of his *Institutio*, which was published at Strassburg in 1539, the groundwork of his theology is essentially Zwinglian. Christ, he argues, is in heaven, and not on earth, and it is of the nature of a human body, to be

1) Bucer's retractationibus non est ut tantopere succenseas. Quia in tradendo sacramentorum usu erraverat, iure eam partem retractavit. Atque utinam idem facere Zwinglius in animum induxisset, cuius et falsa et pernicioiosa fuit de hac re opinio. Opp. X, b, 345 sq.

2) Tibi testatum esse volo, me nolle cum iis litigare, qui veram corporis ac sanguinis Domini communicationem in coena statuunt: quin potius omnes, apud quos vel gratia vel auctoritate valeo, assidue hortor, ut in ea diserte commendanda et illustranda quanto possunt studio elaborarent. Neque vero mihi unquam placuit eorum consilium qui in evertenda localis praesentiae superstitione nimis occupati verae praesentiae virtutem vel elevabant extenuando, vel subticendo ex hominum memoria quodammodo delebant. Sed est aliquid medium quod ita tenere possis, ut neque videaris deflectere ad prodigiosa illa papistarum deliria, neque tamen dissimules veram participandae Christi carnis rationem. Opp. X, 445.

in one certain place.¹⁾ "And as we are with our eyes and hearts raised up into heaven, there to seek Christ in the glory of his kingdom, we are thus fed by his body under the symbol of the bread, and distinctly drink of his blood under the symbol of the wine, that we may enjoy him whole and entire."²⁾ And in his treatise on the Lord's Supper, written in French at Strassburg in 1540, he says: "We confess, then, with one mouth, that as we receive the Sacrament *in faith* according to the Lord's ordinance, we are truly made partakers of the very substance of the body and blood of Christ. . . . On the one part, we should, in order to exclude all carnal fancies, *raise our hearts up to heaven*, not thinking that the Lord Jesus is so far debased as to be enclosed under any corruptible elements. On the other hand, so as not to detract from the efficacy of this holy mystery, we should think that this is done by the secret and miraculous power of God, and that the Spirit of God is the bond of this partaking, wherefor it is called spiritual."³⁾ In the same tract the author strictures both Luther and Zwingli; he holds that Luther erred on his side, and Oecolampad and Zwingli, on theirs.⁴⁾ Of these he says

1) Ea vero est carnis conditio, ut uno certoque loco . . . constet. Opp. I, 1008.

2) Si oculis animisque in coelum evehimur, ut Christum illic in regni sui gloria quaeramus, ita sub panis symbolo pascemur ejus corpore, sub vini symbolo distincte ejus sanguine potabimur, ut demum toto ipso perfruemur. Opp. I, 1009.

3) Nous confessons doncq tous d'une bouche, que en recevant en Foy le Sacrement, selon l'ordonnance du Seigneur, nous sommes vrayment faictz participans de la propre substance du corps et du sang de Jesus Christ. . . . D'une part il nous fault, pour exclurre toutes phantasies charnelles, eslever les cueurs en hault au ciel, ne pensant pas que le Seigneur Jesus sois abaissé iusque là, de estre enclos soubz quelques elemens corruptibles. D'autre part, pour ne point amoindrir l'efficace de ce saint mystere, il nous fault penser que cela se fait par la vertu secrete et miraculeuse de Dieu, et que l'Esprit de Dieu est le lien de ceste participation, pour laquelle cause elle est appellée spirituelle. Opp. V, 460.

4) Nous avons doncq en quoy Luther a failly de son costé, et en quoy Oecolampade et Zuingle ont failly du leur. Ibid. p. 459.

that while laying stress upon Christ's humanity and abode in heaven, "they had forgotten to show what presence of Jesus Christ is to be believed in the Supper, and what manner of communication of his body and his blood is there received."¹ And of Luther he continues: "So that Luther thought they would not leave any thing else than the mere signs, without their spiritual substance."² Now Luther *thought* no such thing. Luther *knew* that Zwingli, not by way of neglect or inadvertency, but purposely and intentionally, excluded from his eucharist every substance save that of the "mere signs" or symbols; and Calvin's "spiritual substance" was a fiction of his own, which he substituted for the true body and blood of Christ, really present and distributed in the Sacrament, a fiction whereby he *may* have deceived himself as he has deceived others into the illusion that his doctrine of the Lord's Supper, though not fully Lutheran, was in such a manner and measure akin to the Lutheran doctrine as to justify his conduct at Strassburg, especially his acknowledgment of the entire Augsburg Confession in 1539.

A. G.

1) Ils oublioient de monstrier quelle presence de Jesus Christ on doit croire en la Cene, et quelle communication de son corps et de son sang on y reçoit. Ibid. p. 458.

2) Tellement que Luther pensoit qu'ilz ne vousissent laisser autre chose que les signes nudz, sans leur substance spirituelle. Ibid.

Practical Theology.

PUBLIC WORSHIP IN THE LUTHERAN CHURCH.

I.

The Nature of Public Worship.

Religion is the relation between God and man wherein God confers upon man his spiritual blessings and man accepts and enjoys those blessings and in his turn devotes himself to the perpetual service of his God. This relation was ordained and established when God created man in his image, as St. Paul writes 1 Cor. 8, 6: *Εἰς θεὸς ὁ πατήρ, ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα, καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν*, which the English Bible renders, "There is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things and we in him" or, in the marginal reading, *and we for him.*" Man was made *for* God as well as *of* God. God was in the very beginning of mankind the *cause* of man and of all the perfections and blessings with which he was endowed, and at the same time the *end and aim* of man. Balduin pertinently comments upon the clause, *καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν*, "In elliptical speech he indicates the purpose of man whereunto he was created of God, namely the glory of God and the participation of eternal bliss in God."¹) Man was created a *religious* being, designated for union and communion with God.

But the fall of man, which resulted in a total corruption of his nature, also resulted in a termination and utter perversion of his primeval relation to God. Natural man after the fall is *ἄθεος ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ*, "without God in the world." Man's iniquities have not only "separated be-

¹) Notat elliptica oratione finem hominis, in quem sit a Deo conditus, munus gloriam Dei et salutis aeternae in Deo participationem. *Comment. in omnes ep. Pauli, ad loc. cit.*

tween him and his God," Is. 59, 2, but "the carnal mind is enmity against God," Rom. 8, 7, the very reverse of religion, and what passed under the pretense of religion, the rites and ceremonies of pagan worship, was in fact "changing the truth of God into a *lie*, worshiping and serving the creatures rather than the Creator," *παρὰ τὸν κρίσαντα*, Rom. 1, 25.

And yet, God loved the world, John 3, 16., and *love* in God was his longing for union and communion with the objects of his holy desire. Though a woman may forget her sucking child, Is. 49, 15, God did not forget fallen mankind. He gave his only begotten son, John 3, 16, and God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, 2 Cor. 5, 19. The word there employed, *καταλλάσσειν*, *νί νος* signifies a change, and a *thorough* change (*κατὰ*), of the existing relation. This is still more explicitly stated when St. Paul says that God "made peace through the blood of Christ's cross, by him to reconcile all things to himself," Col. 1, 20. And here the word *ἀποκαταλλάσσειν* is used, which by virtue of the preposition *ἀπὸ* indicates the *reestablishment* or *restitution* of the *former* relation. And it is, furthermore, remarkable that *καταλλάσσειν* and *ἀποκαταλλάσσειν* are never employed with God, but always with man, as their object.¹⁾ Man had been estranged from God; man was reconciled to God by the redemption in Christ Jesus. And now in him, in his name, man may again appear before his God with acceptable sacrifices. The Gospel whereby sinners are "turned to God from idols to serve the living and true God," 1 Thes. 1, 9, is the Gospel by which the benefits of Christ, the Mediator, are appropriated to the individual sinner. God would bless us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places *in Christ* only, according as he has chosen us *in him*, having predestinated us unto

1) Rom. 5, 10. 1 Cor. 7, 10. 2 Cor. 5, 18. 19. 20. Eph. 2, 16. Col. 1, 20. 22.; also *καταλλάγή*, Rom. 5, 11. 11, 15.

the adoption of children by *Jesus Christ* to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will, to the praise of the glory of his grace, wherein he hath made us accepted *in the beloved*, in whom we have redemption through his blood.¹⁾ "It is from eternity decreed of the Father, that whom he would save, he would save through Christ, as he himself says, 'No man cometh unto the Father, but by me,' and again, 'I am the door; by me if any man enter in, he shall be saved.'"²⁾ Thus also, we are "an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God *by Jesus Christ*;"³⁾ all our worship with praise and thanksgiving is vain, unless it be offered up "in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ."⁴⁾ Religion, or communion with God, and the exercise of religion, true worship of God, is possible only in union with Christ, and through Christ, by whom we are children of God.

Into this relation, man, who is by nature a child of wrath,⁵⁾ can enter only by regeneration,⁶⁾ which is, essentially, the bestowal of faith. By faith in Christ Jesus we are the children of God,⁷⁾ and by the washing of regeneration,⁸⁾ we have put on Christ, having been baptized *into* Christ,⁹⁾ and are now "alive to God through Jesus Christ, our Lord."¹⁰⁾ Every Christian may and should appropriate to himself the words of St. Paul, "God, whose I am, and whom I serve."¹¹⁾ The word here employed in the original, *λατρεύω*, as also *λατρεία*, is, in the N. T., used exclusively of religious service. These two things, to be God's, and to serve God, must always go together. Without the *εὐνοια θεου*, there can be no *λατρεύειν θεῷ*, and where the former

1) Eph. 1, 3—7.

2) Formula of Concord, Sol. Decl. XI, 66.

3) 1 Pet. 2, 5.

4) Eph. 5, 20. Col. 3, 17.

5) Eph. 2, 3.

6) John 3, 3, 5.

7) Gal. 3, 26.

8) Tit. 3, 5.

9) Gal. 3, 27.

10) Rom. 6, 11.

11) Acts 27, 23; θεός, ὃν εἰμι καὶ ὃ λατρεύω.

is, there the latter is sure to be. As true as the words of Christ are when he says, "Without me ye can do nothing,"¹⁾ as true are also the words spoken immediately before, "He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit."²⁾ Religion, being a relation between God, who is life, and regenerate man, walking in newness of life, must be active, and mutually active, God graciously giving and man willingly receiving; man willingly offering and God graciously accepting the offerings of his children.

The children of God collectively considered are the *Church*. All Christians are said to be "of the household of faith,"³⁾ and "of the household of God,"⁴⁾ one great family of the one God and Father of all.⁵⁾ They are united in one spiritual organism, the body of Christ,⁶⁾ who is the one and only head of his body,⁷⁾ and in all of them, "worketh that one and selfsame Spirit,"⁸⁾ the Spirit of holiness, of prayer, by whom they cry, Abba, Father.⁹⁾ While "unto every one of them is given grace according to the gift of Christ,"¹⁰⁾ the various gifts are also intended for "the work of the ministry, the edifying of the body of Christ,"¹¹⁾ for mutual instruction and admonition,¹²⁾ and for common sacrifices of praise and thanksgiving.¹³⁾ Every congregation of Christians is a religious community; and as religion is not a dormant relation, but alive and active, the communion of religion demands or implies common exercise of religion, or *public worship*, worship not of the individual only in his heart or in his closet, but of the household of God, the congregation of children of God,

1) John 15, 5.

2) Ibid.

3) Gal. 6, 10: οἰκεῖται τῆς πίστεως.

4) Eph. 2, 19: οἰκεῖται τοῦ θεοῦ.

5) Eph. 4, 6.

6) Eph. 4, 16. Rom. 12, 4. 8. 1 Cor. 12, 12—31.

7) Eph. 1, 22. 4, 15. 16. 5, 23. Col. 1, 18. 2, 19.

8) 1 Cor. 12, 11.

9) Rom. 8, 15.

10) Eph. 4, 7.

11) Eph. 4, 12—16. 1 Cor. 12, 4—7. 25.

12) Col. 3, 16.

13) Col. 3, 15. 16.

jointly and in common meeting their God, receiving of him the blessings of his bounty, and offering up to him their sacrifices. Public worship is a manifestation of the life and health and vigor of the Church, the body of Christ, and, likewise, by divine ordinance, an institution intended for and conducive to the perpetuation and extensive and intensive increase of the Church and its members. Whatever is inconsistent with the true nature of the Church, or not conducive to its prosperity, or foreign to the spiritual priesthood of its members, is out of keeping with the nature of public worship.

II.

The Agents in Public Worship.

Religion being active communion between God and man, and public worship, the public exercise of that communion, the very nature of public worship implies and demands that in the religious exercises of the congregation, assembled in Christ's name, he being in the midst of them, both God and man be mutually active in a mode and manner peculiar to the exercise of religion. And it has been said by an author not a theologian, that Christianity is the only religion which has no place for human mediators. Christians are all of them priests, 1 Pet. 2, 9. Apoc. 1, 6. 5, 10, having free access to the throne of grace,¹⁾ and to the holiest.²⁾ Our congregations are not by any means usurping rights and privileges not properly their own, but rather exercising their spiritual birthright, when with one accord they voice forth their songs and chants, the incense of their prayers and other sacrifices rising from their own lips to the throne of Majesty. It is in recognition of the spiritual priesthood of all Christians assembled for, and active in, their common worship, that the collects and other common prayers of our public services are according to our Liturgies

1) Heb. 4, 16.

2) Heb. 10, 19.

preceded by the words of exhortation, "Let us pray." Considered from this point of view, the use of a Liturgy or Book of Forms in public worship is highly appropriate, inasmuch as by the acceptance of the Agenda the congregation recognizes the forms of prayer therein contained as its own prayers to be pronounced in the name of the entire congregation, and the minister should not, therefore, without good and sufficient reason change those forms and deviate from them while he is the mouth of the congregation as he reads or chants the forms of the Liturgy.

But here it should be noted, that in a visible congregation assembled for public worship those only who are members of the invisible church of Christ, the true believers, are also true worshipers. The songs and prayers of all the hypocrites who may occupy pews among or with the true worshipers are not truly acts of worship, but the mere semblance of what they appear to be. The exercise of religion is impossible without religion. Thus also, the minister, when he pronounces the prayers of the assembled worshipers, is the mouth of the true believers only, not of hypocrites. The *Amen* of the congregation, whereby the worshipers acknowledge as their own the prayer uttered by their minister, is truly Yea and Amen only as it comes from hearts that put their trust and confidence in God through Jesus Christ. The recital of the Creed, spoken by the minister and confirmed by the *Amen* of the congregation, or spoken in concert or sung in the metrical form of a hymn by the congregation, in our public services, is expressive of our recognition of the priesthood of all believers and of true believers only, in our public worship, according to the words of Christ: "They that worship the Father must worship him in spirit and in truth."¹⁾

Thus, then, the Christian congregation of believers is on the one hand active in the religious exercises of the

1) John 4, 24.

church, and though the congregation may, and in a measure does, give utterance to what is in the hearts and minds of all, through the mouth of an individual person, that person is not a mediator between God and the congregation, but a minister in the service of his brethren.

But the minister is also a servant of *God*. God is also active in the public exercise of religion, and that also without the intercession of human mediators beside the one Mediator between God and man, the man Jesus Christ,¹⁾ in whom God has blessed us and continues to bless us with all spiritual blessings.²⁾ And yet God will not deal with us immediately, but only through the means of grace.³⁾ In all places where he records his name, he will come unto us, and will bless us;⁴⁾ and the record of his name is in his word and sacraments. The words of St. Paul directed to the church of Corinth apply to all congregations: "Ye are enriched by him in all utterance and in all knowledge, even as the testimony of Christ was confirmed in you."⁵⁾ The gospel of Christ is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth;⁶⁾ it is the hand of God filled with all the blessings intended for the children of God, even as faith is the hand whereby those blessings are received by the children of God.

And not only has God determined by what means he would visit his people in the sanctuary, but he has also ordained in what manner those means are to be publicly administered. "Let all things be done decently and in order,"⁷⁾ says St. Paul, and the "order," the divine *τάξις* for the public administration of the means of grace is that of the ministerial office. The ministers of Christ are to be

1) 1 Tim. 2, 5.

2) Eph. 1, 3.

3) Augsb. Conf. Art. V. Smalc. Art. P. III, Art. VIII, 3. 9. F. C. Sol. Decl. II, 48. 50. 52.

4) Exod. 20, 24.

5) 1 Cor. 1, 5. 6.

6) Rom. 1, 16.

7) 1 Cor. 14, 40: πάντα εὐσχημόνως καὶ κατὰ τάξιν γινέσθω.

stewards of God,¹⁾ and of the mysteries of God.²⁾ Christ has given pastors and teachers for the perfection of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ,³⁾ and where the church is assembled for common edification, and to receive grace for grace from the fulness of Christ, the ministers of Christ are to exercise their stewardship in the work of the ministry, preaching the gospel and administering the sacraments. The Augsburg Confession says, "That no one should teach or preach publicly in the church, or administer the sacraments, except he be rightly called."⁴⁾ And when and where the minister of Christ performs the functions of his office, God by his word and sacrament through his servant offers forth the spiritual gifts of his goodness and mercy, the Father in heaven through his steward dispenses and distributes to the children of the household what they have come to ask and to receive. And since it is God who by his means of grace gives and appropriates what they contain, the faith or unbelief of the minister does not affect the efficacy or validity of the words by him pronounced or the acts by him performed. While the Christian is a member of the church and a true worshiper by virtue of his regeneration, or inasmuch as he is in a state of faith, the minister is a minister of God and of the church by virtue of his call, as the Apology says: "The sacraments, baptism, etc., are not void of efficacy or power because they may be administered by unworthy and godless men. For because of the call of the church such men are there;"⁵⁾ and Luther says: "The call and commission makes pastors and preachers;"⁶⁾ and Chemnitz: "The chief strength of the ministry is this, that it is God's

1) Tit. 1, 7: οἰκονόμος θεοῦ.

2) 1 Cor. 4, 1: οἰκονόμοι μυστηρίων θεοῦ.

3) Eph. 4, 11. 12.

4) Art. XIV.

5) Apol. De Eccles. 28. Lat. text: "Repraesentant Christi personam propter vocationem ecclesiae."

6) Walch V, 1061.

will to be with the ministry by his Spirit and grace and efficaciously work thereby. And he who is legitimately called to the ministry and duly administers that office, may surely hold that to him also such promises pertain as Is. 49, 2, and again, ch. 51, 16 . . . Luke 1, 76 . . . 1 Tim. 4, 16 . . . 1 Cor. 15, 58 . . . 1 Cor. 9, 9 . . . 2 Cor. 2, 12.”¹⁾ For this reason we say with the Augsburg Confession: “The sacraments and the word are effectual, by reason of the institution and commandment of Christ, though they be delivered by evil men.”²⁾

What has been said concerning the agents in public worship is at variance with and in direct antithesis to the doctrine of the Roman church, according to which the only real agent in the public exercise of religion is, in fact, the priest. It is the priest who ever anew offers up unbloody sacrifice for the sins of the quick and the dead and carries before God the prayers of the congregation. In all this there is really no occasion for active concurrence on the part of the congregation. The priest is the mediator between God in heaven and the congregation on earth and in purgatory. The Roman mass with its prayers and other forms couched in words of a language unintelligible to the people and chanted, or spoken in an undertone, in the presence or absence of a congregation, with responses and sequences, Gloria and Credo, sung by a choir in the same foreign language above a silent congregation, is not an exercise of communion between God and man, but a demonstration indicative and variously expressive of a separation between God and man necessitating the intercession of priests not of the people but separated from the people by their or-

1) Praecipuus ministerii nervus est, quod Deus Spiritu suo et gratia sua vult ministerio adesse et per illud efficaciter operari. Et *qui legitime ad ministerium vocatus est* et rite illud administrat, illi certe potest statui ad se etiam pertinere illas promissiones Jes. 1, 76 cet. *Loci theol.* III, m. p. 120.

2) A. C. Art. VIII.

dination, celibacy, chancels, language, and privileges, performing in the gulf between God and man the mysterious rites of an expiatory sacrifice in open denial of the sufficiency of the sacrifice once offered up on Calvary. The Roman mass is, thus, so far from being a form of Christian worship, that it is rather the pomp of Antichrist, an abomination of desolation standing in holy places, which should be shunned by every one who would bear the name of a Christian.

On the other hand, the Lutheran conception of public worship is not that of the Zwinglian and Calvinistic churches. According to the reformed theologies, the word and sacraments are not really the means of grace whereby God offers the gifts of his grace and works in us the acceptance of such gifts. Though reformed theologians speak of "means of grace," their enumeration of what they term means of grace, and their utterances on the work of the Spirit show their position to differ very widely from ours. Shedd, in his Dogmatic Theology, gives the first place among his "means of grace" to "Confession of faith and church fellowship."¹ In the same sense he terms the Word of God and the Sacraments means of grace.² In another place he writes: "The appointed means of grace are the word, the sacraments, and prayer."³ Of the sacraments he says: "They are means of grace, dependent like the other means upon the accompanying operation of the Holy Spirit and consequent faith in the soul of the recipient."⁴ The operation of the Spirit is here conceived as *accompanying* the sacraments, not as exerted *through* the sacraments as the *means* whereby the Spirit mediately performs his work, and as "dependent upon consequent faith," not as an instrumental *cause* of faith, entering in between the efficient cause and the subject in which the effect is to be produced. According to Zwingli, all sacraments are so

1) Vol. II, p. 562.

2) Ibid. p. 526. 563.

3) Ibid. p. 506.

4) Ibid. p. 564.

far from conferring grace as not even to bring it nearer.¹⁾ And of "Prayer as a Means of Grace" Dr. Hodge writes: "Means of grace, as before stated, are those means which God has ordained for the end of communicating the life-giving and sanctifying influences of the Spirit to the souls of men. Such are the word and sacraments, and such is prayer. It has not only the relation which any other cause has to the end for which it was appointed, and thus is the condition on which the blessings of God, providential or spiritual, are bestowed; but it brings us nearer to God, who is the source of all good."²⁾ This view of the means of grace must result in a confusion of the agencies active in public worship, a shifting of the twofold relation of the minister of Christ and of the congregation, and an utter impossibility of properly classifying the various acts of public worship of which it is our intention to treat in subsequent chapters.

A. G.

1) Credo, imo, scio, omnia sacramenta tam abesse ut gratiam conferant, ut ne adferant quidem. Zwinglii Fidei Ratio. Ed. Niemeyer, p. 24.

2) Charles Hodge, Systematic Theology, Vol. III, p. 708.

(To be continued.)

A SHORT EXPOSITION

of the

Small Catechism of Dr. Martin Luther,

published by

the German Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio,
and other States.

INTRODUCTION.

1. What is a Catechism?

An instruction in questions and answers.

2. Who has written our Small Catechism?

Doctor Martin Luther.

3. Whereof does he treat in this brief instruction?

Of the chief parts of Christian doctrine.

4. Whence has Luther taken this doctrine?

From the Holy Scripture or the Bible.

5. What is the Bible?

It is the Word of God, written by inspiration of the Holy Ghost by the holy Prophets in the Old Testament and by the Apostles and Evangelists in the New Testament, to make us wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus.

6. Which are the Chief Parts of Christian doctrine?

1. The Ten Commandments; 2. the Creed; 3. the Lord's Prayer; 4. the Sacrament of holy Baptism; 5. the Office of the Keys and Confession; 6. the Sacrament of the Altar.

Part I.

The Ten Commandments.

7. What are the Ten Commandments?

They are the holy will of God, or the Law, wherein God tells us, how we are to be and what we are to do or not to do.

8. When has God given this law?

In the creation of man He has written it in man's heart, and afterwards He has laid it down in ten commandments, written on two tables, and published it through Moses.

9. What is the Sum of the First Table?

"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind." Matt. 22, 37.

10. What is the Sum of the Second Table?

"Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Matt. 22, 39.

11. What, then, is in one word the Sum of all commandments?

Love.

12. Whom does God mean when in the ten commandments he says, "Thou shalt"?

Me and every other man.

THE FIRST TABLE.

THE FIRST COMMANDMENT.

13. Which is the first commandment?

Thou shalt have no other Gods before me.

14. What does this mean?

We should fear, love, and trust in God above all things.

15. What is forbidden in the first commandment?

All manner of idolatry, whether it be really to regard and adore a creature as God, or to fear, love, or trust in creatures as we should fear, love, and trust in God alone. (Coarse and fine idolatry.)

16. What is enjoined in the first commandment?

That we should fear, love, and trust in God above all things.

THE SECOND COMMANDMENT.

17. Which is the second commandment?

Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain.

18. What does this mean?

We should fear and love God, that we may not curse, swear, use witchcraft, lie or deceive by His name; but call upon it in every trouble, pray, praise, and give thanks.

19. Why do we here and in the following commandments say,
"We should fear and love God"?

Because from the fear and love of God the fulfillment of all other commandments should flow.

20. What is God's name?

God, as He has revealed Himself to us.

21. What is forbidden in this commandment?

We should not take God's name in vain, especially by cursing, swearing, using witchcraft, lying or deceiving by His name.

22. What is cursing by God's name?

To blaspheme God, or to invoke upon one's self or others the wrath and punishment of God.

23. What is swearing by God's name?

To call upon God as the witness of truth or the revenger of falsehood.

24. What manner of swearing is forbidden?

False, blasphemous, and frivolous swearing, and all oaths in uncertain things.

25. What manner of swearing is permitted, and even enjoined?

Whatever swearing is demanded by the glory of God and the welfare of our neighbor.

26. What is using witchcraft by God's name?

Using God's name or word without His command and promise to perform supernatural things, such as conjuring, fortune-telling, consulting the dead, and similar diabolical practices.

27. What is lying or deceiving by God's name?

Adorning false doctrine or ungodly life with the word and name of God.

28. What is enjoined in the second commandment?

We should call upon God's name in every trouble, pray, praise, and give thanks.

THE THIRD COMMANDMENT.

29. Which is the third commandment?

Thou shalt sanctify the holy day.

30. What does this mean?

We should fear and love God, that we may not despise preaching and His word; but hold it sacred, and gladly hear and learn it.

31. Does this commandment demand of us that we should keep the sabbath, feasts, or holy days of any kind, as the people of God did in the Old Testament?

No; for in the New Testament all this has been abolished by God Himself.

32. Wherefore do we then celebrate Sunday and other feasts?

Not by divine command, but in order to have time and occasion for public worship.

33. What is, therefore, forbidden in the third commandment?

We should not despise preaching and God's word.

34. How is this done?

By tardily, carelessly, or not at all, attending public worship or using the written Word of God and the Sacraments.

35. What is enjoined in the third commandment?

We should hold preaching and God's Word sacred and gladly hear and learn it.

THE SECOND TABLE.

36. What is the sum of the second table?

Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. Matt. 22, 39.

37. Who is our neighbor?

Every one who is in need of our love.

THE FOURTH COMMANDMENT.

38. Which is the fourth commandment?

Thou shalt honor thy father and thy mother, that it may be well with thee, and thou mayest live long on the earth.

39. What does this mean?

We should fear and love God, that we may not despise our parents and masters, nor provoke them to anger; but give them honor, serve and obey them, and hold them in love and esteem.

40. Who are parents and masters?

Father and mother and all those who, according to God's ordinance, are placed above us in home, state, school, and church.

41. What is forbidden in the fourth commandment?

We should not despise our parents and masters, nor provoke them to anger.

42. How is this done?

When we do not respect their dignity and will, and provoke them to just anger by disobedience or any kind of malice.

43. What is enjoined in the fourth commandment?

We should give honor to our parents and masters, serve and obey them, and hold them in love and esteem.

44. How is this done?

When we truly regard them as God's substitutes, do for them what we can, obey them in all things in which God has placed them above us, and esteem them as a precious gift of God.

THE FIFTH COMMANDMENT.

45. Which is the fifth commandment?

Thou shalt not kill.

46. What does this mean?

We should fear and love God, that we may not hurt nor harm our neighbor in his body; but help and befriend him in every bodily need.

47. What is forbidden in the fifth commandment?

That we should not hurt or harm our neighbor in his body; that is, we should do or say nothing whereby his life may be destroyed, shortened, or embittered, and bear no anger nor hate against him in our hearts.

48. What is enjoined in this commandment?

That we should help and befriend our neighbor in every bodily need, and hence be merciful, meek, and forgiving towards him.

THE SIXTH COMMANDMENT.

49. Which is the sixth commandment?

Thou shalt not commit adultery.

50. What does this mean?

We should fear and love God, that we may lead a chaste and decent life in word and deed, and each love and honor his spouse.

51. What is marriage?

The life-long union of man and wife unto one flesh, which was instituted by God and is entered into by right-ful betrothal.

52. What is forbidden in the sixth commandment?

Whatever breaks, violates, or desecrates the divine ordinance of matrimony, be it in or out of wedlock by deed, word, or desire.

53. What is enjoined upon all men in this commandment?

To lead a chaste and decent life in word and deed.

54. What is required thereto?

That we quench the evil desires by God's Word and prayer, industry and temperance, and that we flee and avoid all opportunity for unchasteness.

55. What is enjoined upon married people especially?

That each should love and honor his spouse, the husband his wife as his help-meet, and the wife her husband as her head.

THE SEVENTH COMMANDMENT.

56. Which is the seventh commandment?

Thou shalt not steal.

57. What does this mean?

We should fear and love God, that we may not take our neighbor's money or goods, nor get them by false ware or dealing: but help him to improve and protect his property and business.

58. What is forbidden in this commandment?

We should not take our neighbor's money or goods, nor get them by false ware or dealing.

59. What particular sins are here forbidden?

Robbery, theft, usury, and fraud, of any kind, as also envy and covetousness within our hearts.

60. What is enjoined in this commandment?

That we should help our neighbor to improve and¹ protect his property and business.

61. How is this done?

By assisting our neighbor by word and deed that his property and business may be increased and preserved from harm.

THE EIGHTH COMMANDMENT.

62. Which is the eighth commandment?

Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.

63. What does this mean?

We should fear and love God, that we may not deceitfully belie, betray, slander, nor defame our neighbor; but defend him, speak well of him, and put the best construction on every thing.

64. What is forbidden in this commandment?

Not only every untrue testimony in court, but all words or thoughts against our neighbor which come from a deceitful heart.

65. What is deceitfully belying our neighbor?

It is with a deceitful heart telling him a falsehood or withholding from him the truth.

66. What is betraying our neighbor?

It is with a deceitful heart revealing his secrets.

67. What is slandering our neighbor?

It is with a deceitful heart speaking evil of him.

68. What is defaming our neighbor?

It is with a deceitful heart injuring or destroying his good fame.

69. What is enjoined in this commandment?

We should defend our neighbor, speak well of him, and put the best construction on every thing.

70. What is defending our neighbor?

Protecting him against false accusations.

71. What is speaking well of our neighbor?

Praising his good deeds and qualities as far as it can be done in keeping with the truth.

72. What is putting the best construction on every thing?

Charitably covering our neighbor's faults and frailties, and explaining in his favor whatever admits of such explanation.

THE NINTH COMMANDMENT.

73. Which is the ninth commandment?

Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house.

74. What does this mean?

We should fear and love God, that we may not craftily seek to get our neighbor's inheritance or house, nor obtain it by a show of right; but help and be of service to him in keeping it.

75. What is forbidden in these words?

We should not craftily seek to get our neighbor's inheritance or house, nor obtain it by a show of right.

76. What is enjoined in this commandment?

That we should help our neighbor and be of service to him in keeping his inheritance or house.

THE TENTH COMMANDMENT.

77. Which is the tenth commandment?

Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, nor his man servant, nor his maid servant, nor his cattle, nor anything that is thy neighbor's.

78. What does this mean?

We should fear and love God, that we may not estrange, force, or entice away from our neighbor his wife, servants, or cattle; but urge them to stay and do their duty.

79. What is forbidden in this commandment?

We should not estrange, force or entice away from our neighbor his wife, servants, or cattle, that is, we should in no wise urge or allure them to leave him and come to us.

80. What is enjoined in this commandment?

That we should urge our neighbor's wife and servants to stay and do their duty.

81. Of what would God remind us particularly in these last commandments, saying, "Thou shalt not covet"?

Of two things; 1, that in God's sight evil lust is indeed and truly sin; and, 2, that we should have no evil lust whatever in our hearts, but only holy desire and love of God and of all that is good.

THE CLOSE OF THE COMMANDMENTS.

82. What does God say of all these commandments?

He saith thus: I, the Lord thy God, am a jealous God, visiting the iniquities of the fathers upon the children to the third and fourth generation of them that hate me, and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me and keep my commandments.

83. What does this mean?

God threatens to punish all that transgress these commandments. Therefore we should fear His wrath, and not act contrary to them. But He promises grace and every blessing to all that keep these commandments. Therefore we should also love and trust in Him, and willingly do according to His commandments.

84. Why does God here call Himself a jealous God?

Because He has the right to give us commandments and will not suffer any transgression of His law to remain unavenged.

85. What does God threaten all them that hate Him and transgress His commandments?

His wrath and displeasure, temporal death and eternal damnation.

86. Upon what manner of children will God visit the iniquities of the fathers to the third and fourth generation?

Upon such as likewise hate Him and follow their parents in their transgression.

87. Whereunto should this threat induce us?

That we may fear His wrath and not act contrary to His commandments.

88. What does God promise those who love Him and keep His commandments?

Grace and every blessing.

89. Whereunto should this promise tenderly invite us?

That we may love God and trust in Him and willingly do according to His commandments.

90. Can we keep God's commandments as He would have us keep them?

No; since the fall natural man cannot keep the law of God at all, and even the regenerate can keep it but imperfectly.

91. What purposes does the law, then, serve?

First, it in a measure checks the coarse outbursts of sin and thereby helps to maintain outward discipline and decency in the world. (*A curb.*)

Secondly, and chiefly, it teaches man the due knowledge of his sin. (*A mirror.*)

Thirdly, it leads the regenerate to know what are truly good works. (*A rule.*)

Of Sin.

92. What is sin?

Sin is every departure from the rule of the divine law.

93. By whom was sin brought into the world?

By the devil, who first departed from God, and by man, who of his own free will suffered himself to be misled by Satan into sin.

94. Of how many kinds is sin?

Of two kinds, original sin and actual sin.

95. What is original sin?

It is that sin which we have inherited from Adam, the total depravity of our whole human nature, which is now deprived of its concreated righteousness, inclined toward all that is evil, and subject to damnation.

96. What is actual sin?

Every transgression of the divine law in desires, thoughts, words, and deeds.

97. How may we, then, be made free from sin, righteous, and heirs of salvation?

Not by the works of the law, but by faith.

Part II.

The Creed.

98. What is the Creed?

It is the confession or doctrine of faith as it is summed up in the Apostles' Creed.

99. Where do we find the doctrine of faith?

In the Gospel.

100. What is the Gospel?

It is the glad tidings of the grace of God in Christ Jesus.

101. What difference is there between the Law and the Gospel?

1. The Law teaches what *we* are to do and not to do; the Gospel teaches, what *God* has done and still does for our salvation.

2. The Law shows us our sin and the wrath of God; the Gospel shows us our savior and the grace of God.

3. The Law demands, threatens, and condemns; the Gospel promises, gives, and seals unto us, forgiveness, life, and salvation.

4. The Law works wrath and kills; the Gospel invites and draws us to Christ, works faith and thus gives us spiritual life.

5. The Law must be preached unto secure sinners, the Gospel to such as are alarmed and terrified.

THE FIRST ARTICLE.

Of Creation.

102. Which is the first article of the Creed?

I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth.

103. What does this mean?

I believe that God has made me and all creatures; that He has given me my body and soul, eyes, ears, and all my

members, my reason and all my senses, and still preserves them; also clothing and shoes, meat and drink, house and home, wife and children, fields, cattle, and all my goods; that He richly and daily provides me with all that I need to support this body and life; that He defends me against all danger, and guards and protects me from all evil; and all this purely out of fatherly, divine goodness and mercy, without any merit or worthiness in me; for all which it is my duty to thank and praise, to serve and obey Him. This is most certainly true.

104. What is God?

God is a Spirit; He is eternal, omnipresent, omnipotent, omniscient, holy, just, faithful, benevolent, merciful, and gracious.

105. Who is the true God?

The Triune God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, three distinct Persons in one divine Essence.

106. How are these divine Persons distinguished from each other?

The Father has begotten the Son from eternity; the Son is begotten of the Father from eternity; the Holy Ghost from eternity proceeds from the Father and the Son.—To the Father especially is ascribed the work of Creation; to the Son, the work of Redemption; to the Holy Ghost, the work of Sanctification.

107. What is to believe in God?

It is to know and accept as true what the Scripture says of God, and with firm confidence to trust and rely in God.

108. Why do we in each of the three Articles say, "*I believe*," and not, "*We believe*"?

Because no one can be saved by another's faith, but every one must for himself believe.

109. Why do we here call the first Person, "the Father"?

Because He is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and also our true Father.

110. Why is God the Father called "Almighty" and the "Creator"?

Because He has by His word made all things out of nothing.

111. What do we signify by "Heaven and Earth"?

All creatures, visible and invisible.

112. Which are the invisible creatures?

The Angels.

113. Of how many kinds are the angels?

Of two kinds, good and evil.

114. What are the good angels?

They are holy spirits, already confirmed in their bliss, and of great power, praising God, carrying out His commands, and serving mankind.

115. What are the evil angels?

The fallen spirits, forever rejected, who are the declared enemies of God and man, and endeavor to destroy the work of God.

116. Which is the foremost among the visible creatures?

Man, because God Himself has prepared his body, has given him a rational soul, and, above all, has made him in His image.

117. Wherein did the divine image consist?

In blissful knowledge of God, and in perfect righteousness and holiness.

118. Do we still bear the image of God?

No; it was lost by the fall, and while in believers a beginning is made of its renewal, it will be fully restored only in eternal life.

119. What do you also confess with the explanation of the first Article?

I believe that God has made me and all creatures; that He has given me my body and soul, eyes, ears, and all my members, my reason and all my senses.

120. What does God still do to you and all creatures?

He preserves and governs me and all creatures.

121. What does He give you for your preservation?

He gives me clothing and shoes, meat and drink, house and home, wife and children, fields, cattle, and all my goods; He richly and daily provides me with all that I need to support this body and life.

122. What do you owe to the government of God?

That He defends me against all danger, and guards and protects me from all evil.

123. What prompts God toward doing all this to you?

He does it all purely out of fatherly, divine goodness and mercy, without any merit or worthiness in me.

124. What, then, is your duty toward the Father in heaven?

For all this, it is my duty to thank and praise, to serve and obey Him.

125. And firmly believing all that you confess, what are your closing words?

This is most certainly true.

THE SECOND ARTICLE.

Of Redemption.

126. Which is the second Article?

I believe in Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord; who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary; suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried; He descended into hell; the third day He arose

again from the dead; He ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty; from thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

127. What does this mean?

I believe that Jesus Christ, true God, begotten of the Father from eternity, and also true man, born of the Virgin Mary, is my Lord, who has redeemed me, a lost and condemned creature, purchased and won me from all sins, from death and from the power of the devil, not with gold or silver, but with His holy precious blood and with His innocent suffering and death, that I may be His own, and live under Him in His kingdom, and serve Him in everlasting righteousness, innocence, and blessedness, even as He is risen from the dead, lives and reigns to all eternity. This is most certainly true.

128. Of whom does this Article treat?

Of Jesus Christ.

129. Why is He called Jesus?

Because He is the only Savior of all mankind.

130. Why is He called Christ?

Christ, or the Messiah, that is, the Anointed, He is called, because He has been anointed with the Holy Ghost without measure, to be our Prophet, Priest, and King.

131. Who is Jesus Christ?

True God, begotten of the Father from eternity, and also true man, born of the virgin Mary.

132. Why do we believe that Jesus Christ is true God?

Because Scripture ascribes to Him divine names, divine attributes, divine works, and divine honor and glory.

133. Why do we believe that Jesus Christ is also true man?

Because Scripture expressly calls Him "man" and attributes to Him the essential parts and works of a man.

134. What two natures are, therefore, in Christ?

The divine nature and the human nature.

135. How are the two natures united in Christ?

In such manner, that the Son of God has received the human nature into His person, and that in this one Person each of the two natures partakes of the properties of the other.

136. For what purpose has the Son of God assumed human nature?

To redeem and save sinful mankind.

137. Why was it necessary that our Redeemer should be man?

That He might be capable of fulfilling the law, of suffering and dying, as all men's substitute.

138. Why was it necessary that He should be God?

That He might be sufficient to appease the wrath of God and to overcome sin, death, and the devil.

139. How manifold is the office which Christ took upon Himself for our salvation?

Threefold, that of a Prophet, a Priest, and a King.

140. Wherein does the prophetic office of Christ consist?

In this, that He has by word and deed revealed Himself as the Son of God and the Redeemer of the world, and by the preaching of the Gospel still reveals Himself.

141. Wherein does the priestly office of Christ consist?

In this, that He has in our stead perfectly fulfilled the law and sacrificed Himself for us, and still intercedes for us with His heavenly Father.

142. Wherein does the kingly office of Christ consist?

In this, that He mightily rules over all creatures, and especially governs and protects His church and at last leads it unto glory.

143. What two *states* do we distinguish in Christ's performance of this office?

The state of Humiliation and the state of Exaltation.

144. Wherein did Christ's state of Humiliation consist?

In this, that Christ according to His human nature did not always and not fully use the divine majesty communicated to His human nature.

145. With which words does the second article describe the state of humiliation?

With the words, "Conceived by the Holy Ghost; born of the virgin Mary; suffered under Pontius Pilate; was crucified, dead, and buried."

146. What does Scripture teach concerning the Conception of Christ?

That Christ was by the miraculous working of the Holy Ghost conceived as true man by the virgin Mary.

147. What does Scripture teach of the birth of Christ?

That Christ was born of the virgin Mary, a true man, and in great poverty.

148. What does Scripture testify of Christ's suffering and death?

That under Pontius Pilate He suffered unspeakable torments of body and soul and died on the accursed tree of the cross.

149. What does Scripture say of Christ's burial?

That His sacred body was laid in the sepulchre and remained there to the third day without seeing corruption.

150. For what purpose did Christ thus humiliate Himself?

To redeem me, a lost and condemned creature.

151. Wherefrom has Christ redeemed you?

From all sins, from death, and from the power of the devil.

152. In what respect has Christ redeemed you from all sins?

He has freed me from the guilt, the punishment, and the dominion of sin.

153. In what respect are you redeemed from death by Christ?

I need not fear temporal death, since eternal death has no longer any power over me.

154. In what respect has Christ redeemed you from the power of the devil?

He has overcome the devil, and conquered him, so that he can no more accuse me, and I can now victoriously withstand his temptations.

155. Wherewith has Christ redeemed you?

Not with gold or silver, but with His holy precious blood and with His innocent suffering and death.

156. How does this work your redemption?

He has thereby rendered satisfaction for me and paid the penalty of my guilt.

157. Whose own have you become by the redemption?

Christ has redeemed me, purchased and won me, so that I am now His own, and He is my Lord.

158. Has Christ redeemed, purchased and won *you* only?

No, me and all lost and condemned mankind.

159. Wherein does Christ's state of Exaltation consist?

In this, that Christ, according to His human nature, fully and continually uses the divine majesty communicated to His human nature.

160. In which words does the second Article describe this state?

In the words, "He descended into hell; the third day He arose again from the dead, He ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty; from thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

161. What does Scripture teach concerning Christ's descent into hell?

That Christ, having been quickened in His grave, exhibited Himself to hell as its conqueror, and triumphed over all His infernal enemies.

162. What does Scripture teach concerning Christ's resurrection?

That Christ on the third day victoriously and with a glorified body issued from the grave and showed Himself alive to His disciples.

163. Why is the resurrection of Christ so comforting to us?

Because it is conclusive evidence

1. that Christ is the Son of God and that His doctrine is the truth;
2. that God the Father has accepted the sacrifice of His son for the reconciliation of the world;
3. that all believers shall rise unto eternal life.

164. What does Scripture testify concerning Christ's ascension into heaven?

That Christ according to His human nature visibly ascended on high and entered into the glory of His Father, there to prepare a place for us.

165. What, according to Scripture, is Christ's sitting at the right hand of God?

That Christ, also according to His human nature, with divine power and majesty rules and fills all things, and especially governs and protects His church, of which He is the Head.

166. What do we, according to Scripture, believe concerning Christ's coming to judgment?

That at the last day He will return visibly and in glory, to judge the world in righteousness.

167. Which words of the Catechism describe the fruit of Christ's exaltation and, likewise, the end and aim of the entire work of redemption?

The words, "that I may be His own, and live under Him in everlasting righteousness, innocence, and blessedness, even as He is risen from the dead, lives and reigns to all eternity. This is most certainly true."

THE THIRD ARTICLE.

Of Sanctification.

168. Which is the third Article?

I believe in the Holy Ghost; the Holy Christian Church, the Communion of Saints; the Forgiveness of Sins; the Resurrection of the Body; and the Life everlasting. Amen.

169. What does this mean?

I believe that I cannot by my own reason or strength believe in Jesus Christ, my Lord, or come to Him; but the Holy Ghost has called me by the gospel, enlightened me with His gifts, sanctified and kept me in true faith; even as He calls, gathers, enlightens, and sanctifies the whole Christian Church on earth, and keeps it with Jesus Christ in the one true faith: in which Christian Church He daily and richly forgives all sins to me and all believers, and will at the last day raise up me and all the dead, and give unto me and all believers in Christ eternal life. This is most certainly true.

170. Of what five points does this Article treat?

1. Of the Holy Ghost; 2. of the Church; 3. of the Forgiveness of Sins; 4. of the Resurrection of the Body; 5. of the Life Everlasting.

1. Of the Holy Ghost.

171. Which is the statement of the first point?

I believe in the Holy Ghost.

172. Who is the Holy Ghost?

The third Person in the Holy Trinity, true God with the Father and the Son.

173. Why is He called the *Holy* Ghost?

1. Because He is Himself holy; 2. because He makes us holy by working faith in us and appropriating to us Christ and His salvation.

174. In what words do you confess that your sanctification is not
your own work?

In the words, "I believe that I cannot by my own reason or strength believe in Jesus Christ, my Lord, or come to Him."

175. In what words do you confess that sanctification is the work
of the Holy Ghost?

In the words, "But the Holy Ghost has called me by the Gospel, enlightened me with His gifts, sanctified and kept me in the true faith."

176. Why do you believe that you cannot by your own reason or
strength believe in Jesus Christ or come to Him?

Because I believe the Scripture, which says that by nature I am spiritually blind, dead, and an enemy of God.

177. What has the Holy Ghost done to bring you to Christ and
sanctify you?

He has called me by the Gospel.

178. What has the Holy Ghost wrought in you by such call?

He has by the Gospel enlightened me with His gifts, that I know Jesus as my Savior, trust and believe, rejoice and take comfort, in Him. (Regeneration. Conversion.)

179. What else has the Holy Spirit wrought in you?

He has sanctified me in the true faith; that is, He has by faith renewed my heart and gives me power to struggle against and overcome Satan, the world, and the flesh, and to walk in godliness and good works.

180. What is a good work in God's sight?

All that a child of God does, speaks, or thinks, in faith, according to the Ten Commandments, for the glory of God and the benefit of his neighbor.

181. What, lastly, has the Holy Ghost wrought in you?
He has, by the Gospel, kept me in the true faith.

182. Has the Holy Ghost wrought all this in *you alone*?

No; but He calls, gathers, enlightens, and sanctifies the whole Christian church on earth, and keeps it with Jesus Christ in the one true faith.

183. Is the Holy Ghost willing to work all this in every one who hears the Gospel?

Yes; but most men obstinately resist the word and Spirit of God and are thus guilty of their own perdition.

2. *Of the Church.*

184. Which is the statement of the second point in the third Article?

I believe in the Holy Christian Church, the Communion of Saints.

185. What is the Church?

The congregation of saints, that is, all Christendom, the sum of all believers; for *only* believers, and *all* believers, are members thereof.

186. Why do we say, "I *believe* in the Church"?

1. Because the Church is invisible, since no man can look into another's heart and see if he believe;

2. because we are, nevertheless, assured by Scripture that the Holy Ghost at all times gathers and preserves a congregation of believers.

187. Why do we believe in *one* Church?

Because all believers are one spiritual body, whose only head is Christ.

188. Why do we say, "I believe in a *holy Church*"?

1. Because all the members of the Church are holy by faith in Christ;
2. because they serve God in holy works.

189. Why do we say, "I believe in a holy *Christian Church*"?

Because the Church is built upon Christ, its sole foundation.

190. Where is this one holy Christian Church to be found?

Wherever and only where the Gospel of Christ is in use; for according to God's promise His word does not remain without fruit.

191. Whom do we signify when we speak of a *visible Church*?

All those collectively who profess the Christian faith and are gathered about God's word, but among whom, beside the true Christians, there are also hypocrites.

192. Whom do we call the *true visible Church*?

All those collectively who have, teach, and confess the entire doctrine of the Word of God in all its purity, and among whom the Sacraments are duly administered according to Christ's institution.

193. What is the proper use of this doctrine of the Church?

When we take heed to be and remain members of the invisible Church; when we, to this end, adhere to the Church of the pure word and confession, contribute toward its maintenance and propagation according to our ability, and keep aloof from all false churches.

3. *Of the Forgiveness of Sins.*

194. Which is the statement of the third point of this Article?

I believe in the Forgiveness of Sins.

195. Why do you say, "I believe in the forgiveness of sins"?

Because by the Scripture I am assured that God by grace, for Christ's sake, through the Gospel daily and richly forgives all sins to me and all believers.

196. How does God forgive sins?

He does not impute their sins to sinners, or, in other words, He declares sinners righteous. (Justification.)

197. Who receives this forgiveness?

Although it has been procured for all men, and is offered by the Gospel to all who hear it, yet only those who believe the Gospel and thus accept the forgiveness of sins, really become partakers of such forgiveness.

198. What then, do we, with our Church, confess regarding the forgiveness of sins, or justification?

That we receive forgiveness of sins and are justified before God, not by our works, but by grace, for Christ's sake, through faith.

199. Can every believer be sure of the forgiveness of sins, and of his salvation?

Yes, he can and should be, because God's promise is sure.

200. Why must we ever firmly maintain this Article especially?

Because it is the chief article of Christian doctrine, by which the Christian church distinguishes itself from all false religions, and which gives all the glory to God alone, and affords enduring comfort to poor sinners.

4. Of the Resurrection of the Body.

201. Which is the statement of the fourth point of the third Article?

I believe in the Resurrection of the Body.

202. What do you believe concerning this point according to Scripture?

That at the last day God will raise up me and all the dead, so that our bodies, the same bodies that have died, shall again be made alive.

203. What difference will there be in the resurrection of the dead?

The believers will rise with glorified bodies to everlasting life; but the unbelievers will rise to eternal death, that is, to everlasting shame, contempt, and torment, in hell.

5. Of eternal Life.

204. Which is the statement of the fifth point in this Article?

I believe in the Life Everlasting.

205. What does Scripture teach concerning eternal life?

That all believers, when they die, are, according to the soul, at once conveyed to Christ, and, after the last day, shall be with Christ, body and soul, and live with Him in eternal joy and glory.

206. To whom shall eternal life be given?

To me and all believers, but only to believers.

207. Are you sure that you also will enter into eternal life?

Yes; for according to the Scriptures I am firmly to believe that, as God has in time called me by the Gospel, enlightened, sanctified, and kept me in the true faith, even so He has from eternity chosen me unto the adoption of children and unto life everlasting, and no man shall pluck me out of His hand.

A. G.

(To be concluded.)

OUTLINES OF PASTORAL THEOLOGY.

By Dr. C. F. W. Walther †.

Translated from the German.

§ 1.

Practical Theology is the God-given practical aptitude, acquired by means of certain aids, whereby a minister of the Church is enabled validly and legitimately, for the glory of God and his own and his hearers' salvation, to perform all the functions encumbent upon him by virtue of his ministerial office.

§ 2.

For the acquisition of this aptitude of Pastoral Theology, as of Theology in general, the three things are required which Luther enumerates in his well-known Axiom: "*Oratio, meditatio, tentatio faciunt theologum.*"

§ 3.

Among the human writings which, in addition to the holy Scriptures, may be made subservient to the necessary *meditatio*, Luther's complete Works, throughout which material for Pastoral Theology is everywhere distributed, as also good text-books of Pastoral Theology, works which treat of special parts thereof or furnish contributions thereto, and the casuistical works of our orthodox theologians, should be mentioned.

§ 4.

Since "no one should teach or preach publicly in the church, or administer the sacraments, without a regular call," as the XIV Article of the Augsburg Confession says in accordance with the word of God (Rom. 10, 15. Jer. 23, 21. Jam. 3, 1. Heb. 5, 4. 5, see also the opening verses of nearly all the Epistles of St. Paul), the first requirement for ministerial work acceptable to God and under

divine blessing is, next to due preparation for the ministerial office, a regular call to such office and the assurance of such call.

§ 5.

In reference to the call to a definite ministerial charge, two things must be considered: 1, whether such call be *valid* (vocatio rata), and, 2, whether it be *rightful* (vocatio legitima s. recta). The call is valid, when it is extended by those who before God are entitled and empowered to issue such call; and it is rightful, when it has been obtained in the proper way.

§ 6.

A Lutheran Candidate can, furthermore, with a safe conscience accept the call of a congregation only when the congregation at the same time declares, 1, its willingness to be served as an orthodox Evangelical Lutheran congregation; 2, its acceptance of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the Word of God; 3, its open adherence to the Symbols of the Lutheran Church, especially Luther's Small Catechism and the Augsburg Confession, as its own Confession, and its agreement to have the pastoral office administered in its midst accordingly; 4, its willingness to conform itself to the orthodox Lutheran Church with regard to distinctive ceremonies; 5, its willingness to introduce pure church- and school-books; 6, its willingness to practice previous application for holy communion; and, 7, its readiness to give full scope to the word of God, whether applied in public or in private, for doctrine, admonition, consolation, or reproof, and to submit to the same.

§ 7.

It is well to have the salary-question settled, and the demands made by the congregation upon the person called, defined, before the acceptance of the call; but herein the recipient of the call must avoid everything whereby he

might appear avaricious or a hireling. To meet possible future dissensions, it is advisable that the chosen candidate should be provided with a written call, signed by order and in the name of the congregation by its representatives, and containing the promise of the necessary support as well as the specification of the principal requirements which the minister is expected to fill. 1 Cor. 16, 3.

§ 8.

Although neither the Examination which a person called to the ministry undergoes and passes before a commission outside of the congregation extending the call, nor the rite of Ordination performed by authorized persons from without, renders the call valid, yet both measures are among the beneficial institutions of the church and, especially the latter, serve, among other things, the important purpose of publicly acknowledging the call as considered rightful and of divine validity by the entire Church. He, therefore, who, except in a case of necessity, omits the one or the other, acts schismatically and makes himself known as one of those whom congregations heap to themselves, having itching ears. 2 Tim. 4, 3.

§ 9.

The proper entrance upon the performance of ministerial duties is of surpassing importance. The *Inaugural Sermon* should tell the congregation chiefly two things; 1, what the congregation should expect of its chosen Pastor; and 2, what the latter expects of the former; all this without flattery and profane captation, with Christian gravity and solemn truthfulness, but with evangelical, winning kindness and unfeigned, heart-felt humility. The sermon may most fitly open with a prayer for divine help and blessing for the new Pastor's self, and close with a fervent intercession for the congregation, in such a way as to make special supplication for every age and station and the several ministerial acts.

§ 10.

When the new Pastor has entered upon his pastorate, it is his duty, during the first weeks, or, according to circumstances, the first months, to *visit* all the families and single persons belonging to his parish, in order to become personally acquainted with them. Acts 20, 20. 1 Thes. 2, 11. John 10, 3. Ezek. 34, 16. 1 Tim. 5, 1—3. Eph. 4, 11. First of all he should visit the *sick*. Matt. 25, 36. Jam. 5, 14, as also those who, because of old age or frailty, cannot attend public worship. In this round of visits he must overlook no one, but, by at once directing his attention to every one, lead them all to understand that he bears in his heart a shepherd's care for each and every soul and does not look upon the poor and humble with less regard than upon the rich and distinguished. Jam. 2, 1—9. He should approach with a degree of confidence those also who do not impress him as being very zealous Christians. 2 Tim. 2, 24. 1 Cor. 9, 19—23. To proceed to a thorough examination of the spiritual condition of each individual at once, would be out of place, and only where disclosures are voluntarily advanced, the new pastor should countenance such overtures. The *school* also, if in operation, should be visited by the minister during the early days of the first week.

§ 11.

Of all the official functions of every Pastor, *public preaching* is most important and should, therefore, receive his most diligent attention. The most important requisites of public sermons are these: 1, that they contain nothing but the *word of God*, and that *in all its purity*, 1 Pet. 4, 11. Acts 26, 22. Rom. 12, 7. Jer. 23, 28. 2 Tim. 2, 15; 2, that the word of God be therein properly *applied*, 2 Tim. 3, 16. 17; 3, that therein *all* the counsel of God for their salvation should be declared to the hearers, Acts 20, 20. 26. 27; 4, that they answer the *special wants* of the hearers, Luc.

12, 42. 1 Cor. 3, 1. 2. Heb. 5, 11—6, 2; and 5, that they be *not too long*.—Further remarks on the right mode of preaching properly pertain to Homiletical Theology.

§ 12.

The *valid* administration of *Baptism* consists in applying water, by immersion, affusion, or aspersion, to the person to be baptized, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

§ 13.

The question as to the *subject* of Baptism, or, *whom* the minister should baptize, is to be answered, 1, all unbaptized *adults* desiring baptism, when they have the knowledge necessary unto salvation, and profess the true faith with word and deed; 2, all unbaptized *children* who, though because of their youth not yet able to give account of their faith, are brought to baptism by those who have parental authority over them, Mark 10, 13—17. Acts. 2, 39; provided the latter do not belong to another minister's charge. 1 Pet. 4, 15.

§ 14.

Among the baptismal usages of our church are the following, viz.: 1, making mention of original sin; 2, naming the child; 3, the so-called small exorcism; 4, the sign of the cross; 5, prayer and benediction; 6, the large exorcism; 7, the reading of Mark 10, 13—16; 8, the laying-on of hands; 9, the Lord's prayer; 10, the renunciation and the Apostles' creed; 11, the use of sponsors; 12, putting on the chrisom cloth; 13, the Benediction.

§ 15.

Whereas a Pastor is not only a teacher, but also a shepherd, an overseer, a watchman, Eph. 4, 11. 1 Tim. 3, 1. Heb. 13, 17. Ezek. 3, 17—21, not only a distributor of the holy sacraments, but also a steward over the same, 1 Cor. 4, 1; and has the earnest order not to give

that which is holy unto the dogs, neither to cast his pearls before swine, Matt. 7, 6; therefore it is his sacred duty to insist upon the previous personal application of those who intend to approach the Lord's Supper, and faithfully and wisely to improve such opportunity for the pastoral *exploration* of the applicants.

§ 16.

While the *Augsburg Confession* expressly testifies that "Confession is not enjoined by the Scriptures, but instituted by the Church," *Art. XXV*, it likewise declares, "Concerning confession they teach that private absolution should be retained in the church, and not abolished." *Art. XI*, and the *Apology* says, "Confession we retain because of absolution, which is God's word, whereby the power of the keys absolves us of sins; therefore it would be against God thus to abolish absolution from the church, etc. Those who despise absolution, know not what forgiveness of sins is or the power of the keys." *Art. of Confession and Satisfaction*. Hence a Pastor may not demand the introduction of private confession as a *conditio sine qua non* of a Lutheran congregation, or see the latter deprived of the pure preaching of the Gospel and perish, rather than to forego the introduction of private confession; he must, on the contrary, beware of vehemently introducing it where it has already gone into desuetude, or of retaining its exclusive recognition, where the abolition of its exclusive use is desired. But he will in an evangelical spirit, by information and admonition, as also by earnest recommendation of private confession, endeavor, for the time being, to secure its diligent use beside that of general confession, and, where it is possible and advisable, its re-establishment as an exclusive custom, or its retention, where it already exists. Under no condition, however, should he yield to such as would not concede the use of private confession and abso-

lution to those individual members who may desire it; for "thus to abolish absolution from the church" would indeed be "against God."

§ 17.

The *valid* administration of the *Lord's Supper* consists in the Consecration, Distribution, and Reception, of the Bread and Wine.

§ 18.

Admission to communion at the Lord's Table is to be granted only to those, 1, who are already baptized; 2, who are able to examine themselves; 3, who cannot be shown to be unchristian or heterodox and would, therefore, unworthily take the sacrament; and, 4, with whom there is no necessity of previous reconciliation or restitution.

§ 19.

A threefold duty is incumbent upon the Pastor with reference to the *marriage* of those who are entrusted to his spiritual care: 1, to solemnize the marriage of none but those whose wedlock is not obstructed by any human (civil) or divine law; 2, to perform the solemnization in the proper manner; 3, to watch that the marriage-bond may not be dissolved as against God.

§ 20.

Before the Pastor proceeds to the official solemnization of marriage, he must not only make sure of being, according to the law of the State, competent to perform such act, but also acquaint himself with the laws of the State in which he is stationed, the observance of which is requisite for valid and rightful marriage, and proceed according to such laws as far as they are not contrary to the word of God.

§ 21.

When called upon to solemnize marriage, the Pastor must carefully investigate whether the parties are not re-

lated in a degree which would, according to the word of God (Lev. 18, 1—30. 20, 10—13. Deuter. 27, 20—23; cf. Matt. 14, 3. 4. 1-Cor. 5, 1), impede the marriage of such parties. In doing this, he must not only consider the *persons* expressly named, but compute all persons of the same *degree* of relationship, as far as this is required by the *general rule* preceding all the special prohibitions of Lev. 18, viz., “None of you shall approach to any that is near of kin to him,” i. e., according to the original Hebrew, “not to *the flesh of his flesh*,” שְׂאֵר בָּשָׂרוֹ, Lev. 18, 6; which does not only include the relatives in the ascending and descending lineage ad infinitum, as well as brothers and sisters, but also all those who are one flesh with those who are already one flesh with the person about to marry; to whom, according to Lev. 18, 14. 20, 20., must be added the wife or husband of a parent’s deceased brother or sister, because of the *respectus parentelae*, such persons being by relationship entitled to respect.

§ 22.

The Pastor must, furthermore, enquire whether either of the parties requesting to be joined in wedlock be not already engaged to a third party by valid and rightful betrothal, or united with another person in marriage still in force and valid.

§ 23.

Although the *publication of the banns* previous to the celebration of marriage is not of divine right, it is a very commendable custom, for the twofold purpose, 1, of publicly announcing the intended consummation of marriage and giving such as may be cognizant of an impediment an opportunity of reporting the same in proper time, and, 2, that the congregation may unite in prayer for the betrothed. The banns are most fitly published on three consecutive Sundays, with an announcement of the full names and the place or places of residence of the parties as well

as of their parents and, according to circumstances, of a deceased husband or wife, lest either of the parties be mistaken for another person; and the publication should be made where the parties as well as where their parents reside. The announcement is followed by an intercession. Should a protest be entered, the publication of the banns is, as an act of notification, continued; but the celebration of marriage is performed only after the adjustment of the protest.

§ 24.

The public marriage ceremony or solemnization of marriage is performed according to the accepted Liturgy with due regard to the usages of the congregation in the midst of which it is performed.

§ 25.

When a party has committed *adultery* by fornication, the Pastor's duty, if the guilty party appear truly penitent, is to admonish the innocent party to condone the offense and continue in the matrimonial state with the penitent spouse; but finally he must leave the decision in this matter with the option of the innocent party and, when the latter has applied for judicial divorce and obtained the same, the Pastor, sufficient proof thereof having been submitted, can not, after the expiration of a proper period, refuse the solemnization of another marriage.

§ 26.

Although the word of God knows of but one rightful cause of the enactment of divorce, viz., fornication, Matt. 19, 9, there is, according to the plain apostolic statement, 1 Cor. 7, 15: "If the unbelieving depart, let him depart; a brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases," another case in which the innocent party may not enact, but *suffer* the dissolution of his or her marriage, that is, when an unchristian spouse deserts the other maliciously,

i. e., with the manifest intention of not returning to the abandoned spouse, and will not by any means be persuaded to return. In this case, the *innocent* party, having, of course, secured a legal divorce, is, according to the declaration of the Apostle, 1 Cor. 7, 15, no longer "under bondage," i. e., no longer bound to the former spouse, *ὁ δεδούλωται*, cf. Rom. 7, 1—3, and must not be denied remarriage at a proper time.

A. G.

(To be concluded.)

NOTE.—These *Outlines of Pastoral Theology* are the Paragraphs or Theses which, together with numerous explanatory notes, consisting chiefly of very copious extracts from the works of our earlier Lutheran theologians, constitute a work first published by the late Professor C. F. W. Walther in vol's XI to XVII (1865—1871) of "Lehre und Wehre," a theological Monthly, in the form of a series of articles entitled "*Materialien zur Pastoraltheologie*," and republished with some additional notes in an octavo volume of 441 pages, the first edition of which appeared in 1872. The full title of the book is, "*Americanisch-Lutherische Pastoraltheologie. Von C. F. W. Walther, Professor der Theologie am Concordia-Seminar zu St. Louis, Mo., und Pfarrer der ev.-luth. Gemeinde daselbst.*"

A. G.

Theological Review.

The Ecumenical Councils. By William T. Du Bose, S. T. D.¹⁾
—Vol. III of "TEN EPOCHS OF CHURCH HISTORY."—
New York, the Christian Literature Co. 1896. XI and
350 pp. Price to subscribers \$1.00.

This book is an object-lesson in modern theology. It "does not profess to be properly a history."²⁾ Its ulterior purpose is that "of tracing the evolution of a process of thought."³⁾ What the author intended was "properly an historical study of the growth and formation of the catholic doctrine of the person of Jesus Christ."⁴⁾ But this process of evolution, according to our author, is not now and never will be finished; "Christology will never be complete."⁵⁾ And Dr. Du Bose is himself occupied in contributing his share toward the "science" of Jesus Christ. "If we are"—these are the closing words of his Preface—

"to study these questions anew we must begin by going back to the past; but we must not expect to find a completed and satisfactory solution of them in past thought, because the mind of Christendom has not yet fully thought them out. We must accept the genuine results of a former science, but we have something of our own to add to those results, as each succeeding age will have something to add to ours." p. XI.

Precisely *what* our author has added of his own, we have not succeeded to discover. As to the subject-matter, his work is avowedly indebted to "the great classic of

1) "DU BOSE, *William Porcher*, S. T. D. Episcopalian; b. at Winnsborough, S. C., April 11, 1836; graduated M. A. at the University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va., 1859; and studied at the theological school, Camden, S. C., 1859—61; was rector at Winnsborough, S. C., 1865—67; at Abbeville, S. C., 1868—71; chaplain of the University of the South, Sewanee, Tenn., 1872—83; and since 1872 professor of moral science and also New-Testament exegesis in the same institution." *Schaff-Herzog Encyclopaedia*.

2) p. IX.

3) Ibid.

4) Ibid.

5) p. X.

Dr. Dorner." But it strikes us that not only the subject-matter, but the entire scope of the book is very much that of Dorner's work, which, according to its very title, is also intended as a "History of the *evolution* of the doctrine concerning the person of Christ."¹⁾ The introductory chapter of Dorner's work opens with the statement that "The idea of the God-man is not an idea peculiar to this or that religion only, but the germs thereof are found in all religion because and inasmuch as they are religions."²⁾ And Dr. Du Bose says in his opening chapter:

"The principle of the cross itself was not a novelty. It had its truth for him only as it has, and always had, its truth for all. . . . If we see in Jesus not merely the ethical but the religious ideal of humanity, just as little was his religion as his morality different from that of all men. . . . There is no spiritual aspiration in *any religion of any race*,³⁾ no feeling anywhere after God if haply it might find him, that has not in it the essential principle of the perfect religion of him who has felt in himself all human want and aspiration, and found in God all human satisfaction and fulfilment." pp. 5. 6.

And again:

"Indeed, if Christianity is the truest, it must also be the most natural thing in the world, and only truest because most natural." p. 9.

Thus also the closing chapter of Du Bose reminds us very forcibly of many things said in the last section of Dorner's work, his review of modern Christology.⁴⁾ And throughout the entire volume before us, there is not a position of any consequence which has not been occupied by some modern German theologian.

Not that we would accuse our author of plagiarism. He is thoroughly imbued with the spirit of modern theology, which is a "fruit-tree yielding fruit after his kind."

1) "Entwicklungsgeschichte der Lehre von der Person Christi."

2) Dorner, Entwicklungsgeschichte etc., vol. I, p. 1.

3) The italics in the quotations here given are our own, unless otherwise stated.

4) Entwicklungsgesch., Vol. II, pp. 1198 cet.

The source and norm of his theology, more especially, his Christology, is not the inspired Word. In fact, he knows of no inspired Word in the scriptural sense of the term. Scripture is to him not the thought and power of *God*, but the "thought and life of the *church*," p. 25, the first self-expression of Christianity and an embodiment of *its* teaching. We quote:

"The first movement, manifestation and self-embodiment of Christianity, as destined to be not merely an idea but a realization and an institution in the world, was certainly its most living, plastic and creative act. When this stage was at an end *it* was found to have *formed for itself* an outward expression of worship and life, an organization for discipline and government, *and a body of sacred books* that embodied *its teaching*. Confining ourselves to the latter we might say that the action of the church in accepting a canon of Scripture need not have been more than the instinctive and practical wisdom of receiving as highest, truest and best *Christianity's own first*, living and creative *expression of itself*, and making this the norm and measure of all *subsequent self-expression* of it. It is self-evident to the mind that takes it in as a whole that the *New Testament* is a single *movement of spiritual and Christian thought* and life and that it is complete and sufficient in itself. It is equally certain that neither the succeeding nor any subsequent age had in it either the plastic capacity or the creative power to take for itself a living form, such as Christianity easily, freely and naturally assumed in its initiative stage. And therefore it was, to say no more, an act of practical wisdom to accept *that first embodiment and expression of itself* as in principle at least and in substance final and irreformable." p. 25.—

"The *writings* that passed into the permanent acceptance of the church as its canon of Scripture belong to a single and complete movement of thought and life *in which Christianity expressed its first and whole impression and conception of the person and work of Jesus Christ*. Only then and there was such an expression and record of the original and originating facts of Christianity possible." p. 27.

"There was much still and would be always for Christian thought and science to occupy itself with the Christian faith and life, but so far as the materials were concerned for all this future occupation, they were complete in *the primitive experience as recorded in the Scriptures*." p. 27 f. —

Dr. Du Bose, of course, also speaks of "inspiration;" but what this term signifies in his mind appears when he says:

"At any rate the church recognized in them (the Scriptures) that highest elevation of the human spirit to receive and understand the things of the divine Spirit which it accepted as its own measure and standard of knowledge and to which it gave the name, by excellence, of inspiration. This highest knowledge of spiritual things as they are revealed in Christ it may be true that we are but is *not necessary* that we should be able to distinguish *in kind* from that which the church continues to possess and which *every human soul may have* of God and of his revelation to it of himself. All that was necessary is that those who were nearest to him in time and space should have so known our Lord as it was essential that he should be known if he was to be any revelation at all of God and of human salvation, and that *they* should have so recorded and transmitted *their knowledge* of him that it should continue to be the possession of the church after them." pp. 40. 41.

There is, then, in our author's conception, no essential difference between the utterances of the church in later days and the writings of the Apostles and Evangelists, between the authority of the utterances of St. Paul and those of the council of Nicaea. He says,

"It was more than two centuries before the church was in condition or circumstances to think and express itself *again* as a whole. p. 28.

The New Testament is a source and norm of subsequent self-expression of the church, since the *church* made it so, and that the church gave it this normative dignity, "need not have been more than instinctive and practical wisdom." p. 25. The Apostles themselves were by no means the authoritative, infallible teachers of the church of their day and future days, and the apostles' doctrine in which the church at Jerusalem continued steadfast from the day of Pentecost¹⁾ was not the sound doctrine which should abide to the end of time. Our volume says:

1) Acts 2, 41. 42.

"Whatever we may say of the apostles, very certainly the infant church of Jerusalem held no perfect and explicit doctrine of the truth completely present in its midst. It would have been pure miracle or magic if it had at once consciously held the whole truth or been wholly free from error. . . . We must remember then that while the infant church was Christian it was also still Jewish and we must endeavor to realize what this meant for its immediate further progress and development. There were certainly many in it who remained much more Jews than they had become Christians and there was probably not one who had become so Christian as to be no longer a Jew. When St. Paul through his experience with Jews and Gentiles was brought at first practically and then theoretically and as a matter of essential and vital principle to see that the church could only become wholly and truly Christian by wholly ceasing to be Jewish, there was not one of the original apostles who was prepared to go the whole length with him." p. 49.

The authority of the Scripture, accordingly, does not rest on the fact that the Holy Spirit spoke through the inspired penmen, and Scripture is not its own and only authentical interpreter, but we are here informed that

"as the right and power of the individual soul to know God and to know the things that are freely given to it of God is thus the *basis* of the authority of Scripture, so equally is it that of the authority of the church in after-time to interpret the Scriptures." p. 40. —

"Not God himself nor Jesus Christ nor the Scriptures could sufficiently attest to us the truth of Christianity as our truth and our life if it were not equally attested as such by the spiritual common sense and experience of men always and everywhere." p. 44. —

"Divine omnipotence and human authority combined cannot of themselves constitute a dogma. That requires in addition a *δοκεῖ*, a *placet*,¹⁾ from the universal spiritual understanding and experience of spiritual and rational men." p. 259.

While our Author says: "It makes no difference for our present purpose what we think of the Bible, or how we define prophecy," p. 9, *we* beg leave to say that it does make a difference for *our* present purpose what a leading Episcopalian theologian and educator of theologians thinks

1) The Author's Italics.

of the Bible, and how he defines Inspiration and fixes the source and norm of Christian doctrine.

How, then, we further ask, are Christian doctrines established? Our Author answers:

"We have thus recognized *the function of the church as a whole as necessary* to a complete comprehension and representation of the truth as it is in Jesus Christ. It was inevitable that the *church* should very soon be forced to discharge this function in the formation of a body of catholic truth." p. 45.

In the beginning, the prospects of success in the performance of this task must have been slender indeed. For we are informed,

"that from the first and always, even within the church, there were not only partial and incomplete conceptions but also denials and contradictions of the essential truth of Christ, it is needless to say. The founder and the first teachers of Christianity foresaw that it was not only inevitable but needful that it should be so. Truth is only made known and indeed only knows itself in conflict with error." p. 29.

Not even the Apostles, perhaps with the exception of St. Paul, were in possession of the truth.

"What theory of the nature and of the person of Jesus Christ is necessarily involved in such an original conception of the effects produced by him, and the abiding and influential relations borne by him to the whole human race, *may not yet be present in the minds or apparent in the testimony of the first evangelists.*" p. 14.—

"To St. Paul as apostle to the Gentiles fell the painful task of cutting Christianity loose from all trammels of Judaism and of exposing their irreconcilable difference and contrast. . . . *The other apostles may very well not have so seen it or so clearly seen it.* . . . St. Paul did not suffer too much, nor did he attach too much consequence to the principle at stake, since—*although he alone at the time may have seen it—the principle* was indeed *the essential and vital one of Christianity.*" p. 19.—

"St. Paul does indeed 'say *my*¹⁾ gospel,' and that as against a narrower and exclusive gospel which would place or magnify barriers in the way of the universal extension of the free gift and impartation of God to humanity in Jesus Christ." p. 18.

1) Author's Italics.

Of course, the first steps in pursuit of truth must have been very uncertain.

"The decision of the church was that in Jesus Christ man was become divine because God was become man. If in reaching this decision there was a *wavering* or a temporary *lingering* on the way, and if *even within the New Testament Scriptures* there can be found at any point evidence of *such halting*, there is nothing in this inconsistent with the character either of the Scriptures or of the truth." p. 17. It was, therefore, a necessary provision that "the church as a whole through the true representatives and leaders of its thought and mind" should be "the *judge* and interpreter of *revelation* and tradition." p. 132.

But was the church prepared to perform these functions, and what do we hear of its leaders and representatives?

"The church had *instinctively* detected and rejected whatever was inconsistent with its faith and life, but doctrinal investigation and speculation, all that we would now call theology, was, as we have said, *confined to very few*." p. 137.

Most of the teachers of the congregations were in a sad plight when they were called upon to assist in doctrinal investigation. Even at the Council of Nicaea,

"of a sudden, and unexpectedly to the great mass of them, the simple pastors of simple flocks were brought together from the ends of the earth and made to give in language above their comprehension a scientific or philosophical reason for the faith that was in them." p. 137.

And when their task was done,

"their faith without knowledge had led them, and they had followed it like Abraham not knowing whither they went." p. 138.

But even men of more excellent talents must have found themselves handicapped and their pathway to truth seriously obstructed by the church itself.

"When the abler and more thoughtful minds of the church like Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria and Origen began to be driven toward the construction of a rational and catholic doctrine of the Trinity they had to encounter a mass of *conservative piety* to

which the application of such methods as pertain to natural and secular knowledge to the truth of God seemed profane and irreligious." p. 79.

"The church at first was Trinitarian simply because the truth is Trinitarian, and because it accepted the truth as it was objective to itself and had not yet converted it into subjective knowledge. That this had to be done, that there had to be formed a subjective consciousness of the church corresponding to the objective form of the truth, is manifest: and it is equally manifest that that *could* only be effected *through manifold mistakes and corrections*, through much high thought and deep experience." pp. 78. 79.

And then, who was to decide whether "with much high thought and deep experience," and after "manifold mistakes and corrections" those "abler and more thoughtful minds" had really developed a religious truth or form of doctrine? Let us hear.

"Just as the reason of humanity points on the whole to the truth and the conscience of humanity acquiesces in the right, so the common or universal spiritual consciousness and experience of the whole Christian church is the only test of what Christianity is. The question is how to get its verdict; and even when under the most favorable conditions and with the best guarantee of truth the council has assumed to render this, it can only be ascertained that the verdict is true, and will stand by a long and silent process through which the decision is referred back to the church again to say whether it has correctly expressed itself through its council. If the church thus accepts the council as its voice, by that fact it imparts to it an authority which is its own and not that of the council. The truth of Christianity is the truth of Jesus Christ, and the truth of Christ is a matter of ourselves as well as of God. If it is indeed the truth and the whole truth of ourselves, then we know that it is God's truth of us. It is impossible that we should know otherwise whether or not it is of God. The authority of the church, the authority of the Scriptures, the authority of our Lord, the authority of God, are all a very great deal along with the authority of a really universal human experience (which means not all experience, but all that truly experiences). Without the latter it would be impossible that all the former should possess for us any weight or value. pp. 46. 47.

This is strong language. But if the authority of the Scriptures, the authority of our Lord, the authority of God,

cannot establish a truth as truly divine, and if, to do this, a really universal human experience is required, then no specifically Christian truth has ever been established; then theology is the most hopeless of all mental occupations, and Christianity the most wretched of all religions. For this, Dr. Du Bose's own words are in evidence. He says:

"The two facts, of the very Godhead and the very manhood, of the completeness of the two natures in the unity of a single personality, were destined to lie side by side in the treasury of the church's thought a long time before they should enter into a really organic and vital union. *Indeed have they done so yet?*" pp. 267. 268.

And:

"The difficulty with Leo, *as with the mind of the church as yet*, is that he did not himself so understand either the divine or the human nature in our Lord as to present a satisfactory and convincing picture of their unity." p. 259.

And again:

"The difficulty with Apollinaris *as with most Christians now* is that he was so concerned that our Lord should be God that he was not sufficiently willing that he should be man." p. 191.

Here, then, we are told that one of the first fundamental truths of Christianity, on which the assurance of our salvation rests, is, as far as the church is concerned, to this day an unsolved problem. And how can it be otherwise when our author has announced on the threshold of his book that "Christology will never be completed"! But such is modern theology, "ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth."¹⁾

We now proceed to review what our author submits on his special subject, the development of the catholic doctrine of the person of Jesus Christ.

"The Christian doctrine of the *Trinity*," he says, "was perhaps before anything else an effort to express how Jesus Christ was God (*Θεός*) and yet in another sense *was not God* (*ὁ Θεός*); that is to say, was not the *whole* Godhead." p. 72.

1) 2 Tim. 3, 7.

This distinction is admitted to have been foreign to the primitive church. "Sabellianism," we are told,

"was not only actually or historically, it was logically and of necessity the first step in conceiving the divine or theological side of the truth as it was revealed through Jesus Christ. To the simplest and most *primitive faith* Christ was *simply God*, not Θεός merely but ὁ Θεός. Nothing less than God—not something, not anything, not everything from God but *God himself*—is what the soul wants." pp. 71. 72.

But that "simple and most primitive faith" appears to have been superseded by another form of doctrine.

"As in the incarnation so in the creation the rational, ideating, creative principle and cause of the world, that which is manifest in phenomena, cannot be anything else than God (θεός) and yet it is *not God* (ὁ θεός)." p. 167.

This is, later on, further explained thus:

"When our Lord said 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father' he did not mean we had seen in him the divine omnipotence or omniscience. . . . Omniscience or omnipotence cannot be in him and he remain man. . . . An omnipotent or omniscient man is an impossibility. . . . Just those things are incarnate in him that *could*¹⁾ become man, not those that could not." p. 332 f.

And again:

"It may not be possible for us to explain how the omniscient, omnipotent and omnipresent Logos entered personally into humanity *without bringing with him into it all these properties*." p. 336.

That this is not the doctrine of St. Paul, according to whom *all the fulness of the Godhead* dwells bodily in Christ,²⁾ is evident, and what our author says concerning the scope of later Christian doctrine of the Trinity is not history, but fiction.

But to do full justice to Dr. Du Bose, it will be necessary that we should give a series of extracts exhibiting his treatment of the Incarnation of the Logos. He says:

1) Author's Italics.

2) Col. 2, 9.

"With the New Testament, all Christology must begin with the fact and facts, precisely as they are, of the human personality and personal life of Jesus Christ. The historical Jesus is *human through and through*. . . . At the same time the Jesus of history is *humanity raised to the power of God*. . . . *Humanity as our Lord received it was not what it is as he has made it*. His conquest in it of sin and death, his own human death to sin and life to God have constituted it at least actually what it was before only potentially, son of God through personal participation in the divine nature, character and life. All this in him was *strictly a human act* and was *only what it was the nature and destination of humanity in and through him to do and become*. It is what is meant by *man's eternal predestination to ~~humanity~~* or the adoption of sons through Jesus Christ unto God. Our Lord *became Son of God through the process*, his whole human life of *love and self-sacrifice* was itself indeed the *process*, by which alone *humanity becomes or can become son of God*." p. 324 f.

"Apollinaris saw first and saw with no little depth and penetration that the *incarnation* so far from being an unnatural or irrational thought was *the very truth of both nature and reason*. . . . What was the Logos in the universe but the ideation of man, what was man but the actualization of the Logos? *The Logos was eternal humanity*, the eternal idea of humanity which was to be actualized in time through the creation. The true end and destiny of man is to be that which *the Logos will become* when he shall through the creation have actualized himself in time. *The Logos and man are then the eternal and the temporal of one and the same thing: the Logos is man*, the eternal of him; and *man is the Logos*, the temporal of him. So that *each becoming the other is only becoming himself*: the eternal Logos temporally in and through creation realizes or becomes itself in man; and man who temporally realizes the Logos in himself eternally realizes or becomes himself in the Logos. The incarnation is *accidentally*, because of the fact of sin and the fall, human redemption; it is *essentially*, and *would be if there were no sin or fall*, *human and cosmical completion*." p. 185.

"Christ is not only individual but *generic* man. He is not only a man but *all men*, who are to be included in him in the church which is the body of the incarnation and in which the Logos is to realize or anew become himself. Apollinaris in this way teaches the *eternal humanity* of the Son of God, as also therefore, in idea at least, the *eternal divinity of man*; and so the eternal predestination and pre-constitution of the Logos and man to become one in the incarnate Son, both God and man. The great and comprehensive *truth* con-

tained in this representation might have been carried out with substantial orthodoxy and with no little gain to the theology that preceded it, if it had been within the grasp of a single mind. . . . That God *must* become man, *must* personally realize or become anew himself in the highest of his creatures, *from the very nature and necessity* of the divine Word to become that which it means, to actualize itself in that of which it is the idea, *was a great thought.*" p. 186.

"He was the man he was, and we shall be the men we shall be in him, because it was God who was incarnate in him in order that through him he may become incarnate in us." p. 14.

"Jesus Christ wholly revealed God in that he was and not otherwise than as he was *the divine revelation of the whole nature, life, and destiny of man.* As such he is the divine and the whole, as well of every man as of *all humanity.*" p. 16.

"It is the nature of man as creation's crown of susceptibility and conscious need of God to be taken into personal and free union and unity with him." p. 196.

"We hope to realize more and more as we proceed that it was the *eternal* divine nature and predestination of the Logos *through nature and through grace to become man*—to become as we have said before not only alike in nature but *one in person with every man.*" p. 87.

"When God shall have incarnated himself in a redeemed and completed humanity it must equally be a *humanity* that has *incarnated in itself the living God.*" p. 86.

"Perhaps the very first impression calculated to be produced by even the most natural and human study of the person of Jesus Christ is that of *the universality of his humanity.* He is man to every man, *the manhood of every man in the world.* . . . Every human being knows himself and becomes himself only in Jesus Christ. . . . So Jesus Christ is God's truth and word to every man of himself—not only of God's self, but of *every man's self.* For the true, better, higher, eternal divine self of every man, that selfhood which is the infinite and eternal aim of every man to realize and attain, is God. It is in this sense that Jesus Christ may be said to be *the Logos, first of all, of man.* . . . It is an *insufficient* account of the incarnation to say that God *assumed our nature.* *He became ourselves.*" p. 82, 83.

"*Human personality* . . . is itself also an *infinite, eternal and absolute thing.* . . . In *this way* the divine Logos and Christ, the divine man who is our Lord, is *eternal and absolute humanity.* 'Not I but Christ' does not mean '*not I but the Logos* or the Second Person in

the Trinity': it means '*not I but my essential and true self or personality*' which while it is in the truest sense 'I' is also *God*.'" p. 316.

"Thus he who was in his deity essential or proper Son of God in his humanity was constituted or *became through his holy obedience and self-sacrifice Son of God by grace* and adoption. He was (Rom. 1, 3) *κατὰ θεῶνα ἀδοκίμη*, through his offering of himself by the eternal Spirit without spot to God, *constituted and instituted Son of God in power by his resurrection from the dead*." p. 308 f.

"Such a *Sonship by grace* the Adoptionists predicated of our Lord in his humanity without at all impugning the proper and essential Sonship of his divinity. It is questioned by some who would impute obscurity and uncertainty to their views whether they meant to associate the divine adoption of humanity in Christ with his birth, baptism or resurrection. Their meaning is clear enough *and is true*." p. 310.

"There was however a limitation in the view of the Adoptionists that not only prevented success in carrying out the *truth* for which they stood but also brought them into a collision with the church as hurtful to it as it was fatal to them. . . . Our Lord was indeed very man, *more truly* even because more wholly and completely *man than we ourselves*, but that does not mean that he is only a *single or particular* human being precisely in the sense in which one of us is so. . . . On the whole there can be little doubt that the Adoptionist representation of the man Christ Jesus as a limited and individual human being like one of us did justify the charge of their great antagonist Aleuin that though they did not mean it their position led practically to a Nestorian twofold personality of the Lord. It would have been infinitely better if the church instead of extirpating Adoptionism for its incompleteness had taken it up and carried it on into a true catholic completion. What was needed to do this was a truer and fuller *construction* of our Lord's humanity than had yet been attained. What the Adoptionists failed to see needed be shown, that it was possible to ascribe to our Lord a true personal *humanity that was in itself also true and proper personal deity* instead of being only united and associated with it. In order to appreciate this it is necessary to reflect upon the peculiar predicates applied and applicable to our Lord's manhood alone among men. Of whom else beside him can it be said that he recapitulates and includes humanity in himself and is the head of it? or that he is *not a single and limited human individual but universal humanity, all men and every man?* . . . Jesus Christ is the personal human perfection of every human person. *It is the end of every man to become Christ*." p. 314 f.

"There is no doubt that man in his divine idea and intention was predestined to incarnate God. . . . Now what we say of man as the head of creation we may say of creation itself. . . . The *whole creation* is already, in its idea and intention, and is predestined to become *actually* as well as ideally the *living body of the living God*—the outward form and perfect expression of his divine Logos, his personal Reason, Wisdom and Word. When in this way we *identify God and the world* and say that he is to fulfil or realize himself in the world, which is to become as it were an outward form and body of himself and not merely an external and impersonal expression of his wisdom and power, we do not mean that the world is going to become the Godhead or the Godhead the world. *In one sense he will become it and it will become he* but in another sense he will forever remain above it and he and it can never be identical." . . . p. 74 f.

"True Christian theism sees *God in Christ* as not only ideal humanity but also *ideal cosmos or universe*." p. 75.

"More than all this, the first mind of the church saw in Jesus Christ the divine *Logos* not only of humanity but of *the whole creation also*. . . . The *Christ of the future* is the goal and crown of the *entire creation of God*. Then and there, where *Creator and creature shall be one*, God shall be all in all. He will have fulfilled himself in all things and all things in himself." p. 83 f.

"If nature is God's work, God does not work outside of it; he works in, not upon it. If there is a *Logos of natural evolution* or creation it may be God's, it *may be God*; but it is also nature's and nature. *The two must be one and not two*. Faith may see it as God, science can and must see it only as nature. God is and acts in nothing whatever otherwise than in the being and acting of the thing itself." p. 85.

"Thus in Jesus Christ the church from the very first recognized the divine personal principle both of *nature and of grace*, the meaning, end and purpose of the whole creation. He is the eternal mind, will and activity of God revealed in all things, everywhere one and the same. He is the truth of the atom, of motion, law, life, of the soul, of human and divine reason, the world, man, God." p. 88.

"The true Christian consciousness knows no operation, influence or presence of God that is not God himself; whatever is divine is personal, is God. To it *nature is God*, events are God, *everything is God* save those finite spirits to whom in the free will God has given the power to be other than himself and even contrary to himself." p. 89.

"In Christ the church sees indeed a man, but not only a man; it sees all men and *the whole creation taken up into and made one with God*, through God's own fulfilling himself in them." p. 183.

"But he who is Logos of God is *Logos of all else*. . . . *He is the rational or ideal world* of which all things are but the outward appearances or phenomena. . . . The only thing in the world that is not in a sense God is sin." p. 328 f.

Maximus the Confessor is criticised in the following remarks:

"Thus Maximus not only asserts for our Lord a true human will, but secures to it a relative independence from the overpowering and effacing activity of the Logos in and through it. But the freedom which he thus preserves in one connection he surrenders in another. In order to insure the certainty of his human obedience, he attributes to our Lord not that truly human holiness which is the result of freedom and choice and of an actual human development and growth, but a holiness necessary and complete from the first and incapable of progress or change. It is a holiness *φύσει*, though not by his divine but by his human nature. It is the effect of his virgin birth by the power of the Holy Ghost that his humanity is *ἀτρεπτος*, incapable of moral change. Thus his humanity is not only not ours which is fallen but it is not that of Adam which was capable of falling; it is a third kind which was neither. And a holiness by necessity of nature and not by act of will is no more a human holiness because the nature is a so-called human one than if it were the divine nature." pp. 287. 288. And again: "*A holiness φύσει*, by necessity of nature either human or divine, *is not a human holiness*." pp. 296. 297.

That all this is not scriptural Christology, is again evident. The Christ of Scripture was God in his mother's womb and in the manger at Bethlehem in precisely the same sense and to the same extent as when he ascended into heaven,¹⁾ and is in no sense generic man, but as truly as any other man a human individual, made of a woman in the fulness of time,²⁾ not of necessity, but according to the counsel of divine wisdom and goodness for the salvation of sinners, not by a human act, or a process of self-sacrifice,

1) Luke 1, 32. 35. 43. 2, 11.

2) Gal. 4, 4.

but by the power of God;¹⁾ God and mankind and God and the world are in no sense identical. Christ is neither ideal nor actual cosmos;²⁾ the impeccability of Christ, who is indeed *φύσει* holy, is taught in Scripture.³⁾

After what we have heard of our author's Christology, we must not be surprised at his doctrine of Justification and Sanctification, when he says:

"The first (truth) is that Jesus Christ is equally God who by a divine incarnation fulfils himself in man, and *man who by a human faith and obedience realizes himself in God*. The second is that Jesus Christ is equally an objective human righteousness or self-realization or salvation, presented to our faith and made ours by divine grace, and a subjective human righteousness *appropriated, made our own and wrought in us by our own obedience*." p. 21.

"It is as true in its place to say that God alone without us cannot make us righteous as it is to say that we ourselves without God cannot be righteous. But St. Paul was standing for the second and if to many he seems to contradict the first it is only seeming. In reality he knows as much that *the material cause and condition of our righteousness is our own being righteous and doing righteously* as he knows that the efficient and producing cause of our righteousness is the grace and power and new creation of God in Christ working through our faith." p. 22.

"The end of the *law* under Judaism was to *make man moral* in preparation for making him spiritual, to convert his unconscious, natural and necessary relation and dependence upon God into a conscious, personal and free one, to make his will his own that he might make it God's. It is a necessary part of the *evolution of a true manhood* that it should *learn both its independence and its dependence upon God*, both that God cannot make it without itself, without the free and *perfect exercise of its own will*, and that it cannot make itself without God, without a free and perfect realization in itself of the divine will." p. 52.

"To say that Christ is our righteousness is to say that he is the absolute freedom of our wills, our spiritual and moral activities." pp. 315. 316.

1) Luke 1, 35. Gal. 4, 4. 5.

2) Matt. 24, 35. 2 Pet. 3, 10. Ps. 102, 26 f.

3) Luke 1, 35. Acts 2, 22—32.

"*Man's redemption*, while it can come only from God, can come only through and in himself and *can consist only in the restoration of the freedom and ability of his own will* and personality to discharge his function by realizing himself and completing and perfecting the world." pp. 205. 206.

"What is of *most consequence* in what is revealed in him is not how God may be human but *how man may become divine*. The former is God's part which we may safely leave to him, *the latter is ours and it behooves us to know and perform it.*" p. 330.

In full keeping with all this we find Dr. Du Bose's doctrine of Predestination, of which the following extracts may serve as specimens.

"Without going further into these questions, the teaching of St. Paul and we may say that of all the epistles of the New Testament is that it is the *natural* predestination of *human nature* to find its complement and completion in a participation in the divine nature, human life in the divine life. And this *κοινωνία* was to be attained 'through Jesus Christ' (Eph. 1, 5). In the man Christ Jesus humanity attained the adoption of sons, was made and became God." p. 308.

"In the Epistle to the Ephesians St. Paul describes humanity as having been eternally predestined to *κοινωνία*, or the relation to God of a *ἰὺς θεός*. Translated into ordinary language this means that man is constituted by his spiritual nature to enter or be taken into such a participation in the divine nature and life as to become a son of God." p. 306 f.

Thus this theology is consistent with itself inasmuch as it is persistently unscriptural, maintaining what the Scriptures explicitly deny, and explicitly denying what Scripture affirms. But being unscriptural, it is certainly not theological. Teaching an incarnation which is not the incarnation taught in Scripture, a divinity of Christ which in a certain sense is not divine, a humanity of Christ which in a sense is not truly human, a redemption of mankind which is not redemption in the biblical sense of the term, justification which is not the forgiveness of sins and cannot justify, salvation which is not *in solidum* the work of God and cannot save, Pauline doctrine which St. Paul never taught — this "theology" is certainly not Christian theology. But

what is it? It is a kind of modern *Gnosis* to which we can pertinently apply the masterly remarks of our author on the Gnosticism of the second century, as follows:

"Gnosticism might almost be said to have taken Christianity and run away with it. But while Gnosticism thus in a sense became Christian, Christianity itself refused to become Gnostic. In many different forms Christologies arose so remote from the sober truth of Christ as wholly to cease to be Christian. The so-called Christian gnosis was not at all Christianity making use of outside philosophical principles or methods; it was outside philosophy of the most reckless speculative type availing itself of Christian ideas and suggestions and perverting them to its uses and ends." p. 63.

Between the "so-called Christian gnosis" as characterized in this extract, and modern so-called theology as exhibited in Dr. Du Bose's book, the analogy is perfect.

We have hitherto discussed the work before us as an object-lesson in modern theology, and as such we deem it highly instructive and profitable reading. But in all fairness we would say that the book is instructive in still another way. Some very good things are said in it. Its portraiture of Constantine is excellent, as also in the main that of Athanasius. We have rarely found so cordial an appreciation of the great theologian of the fourth century as here. It affords us pleasure to quote such statements as:

"We must remember that during the time when the imperial policy toward Christianity was turning from persecution to patronage and men had everything to gain instead of everything to lose by becoming Christians, the immediate effect had been to convert the church from a purely religious to a very largely secular and political body." p. 139.

Dr. Du Bose makes a fine point when he says:

"Finally it was not the least providential circumstance of the career of Athanasius that his very youth when called into the arena left him a long lifetime in which to labor and to suffer for the principles which none of his contemporaries but himself could have brought to their final and permanent triumph." p. 124.

With reference to the unionistic attitude of Eusebius of Cesarea and his followers in submitting their undefined

creed and opposing the *ὁμολογίον* at Nicaea we find the exquisite stricture:

"The claim for it (the Eusebian formula) was that it was the language of Scripture, and of the traditional faith; the issue made was that it was wrong and unwise to use a language outside of these to express or explain divine truth. But the question was not what Scripture and tradition said—they were all agreed on that; but what Scripture and tradition meant, upon which they disagreed. You cannot interpret and explain Scripture by simple quotation of scriptural language or expressions, but only by the use of other terms by means of which they might be defined and illustrated." p. 122.

Of Pope Leo I, who happened to be on the orthodox side in the Eutychian controversy, our author very truly remarks:

"It was characteristic of Leo that throughout his career he subordinated and consecrated his great personal gifts and powers to the task of consolidating and extending the paramount authority of the Roman see." p. 263.

And we would most cordially recommend to the most serious consideration of every theologian, our author not excepted, his beautiful saying: "*Truth alone unites, error only hopelessly confuses and divides.*" p. 127. A. G.

Christianity and Social Problems. By Lyman Abbott.¹⁾ Boston and New York. Houghton, Mifflin and Co. 1896.
—370 pages 16mo., gilt top, \$1.25.

"Christ's mission was twofold,"—this is the opening statement of Dr. Abbott's *Preface*, and it is thus in a twofold sense the *πρῶτον ψεῦδος* of his book. Christ's mission

1) "*Abbott, Lyman, D. D., Congregationalist, b. at Roxbury, Mass., Dec. 18, 1835; graduated at New York University, 1853; was for a time partner in his brother's law-firm, but then studied theology under his uncle, J. S. C. Abbott, and was pastor at Terre Haute, Ind., 1860—65; Secretary American Union (Freedmen's) Commission, New York, 1865—68; pastor at New-England Church, New York, 1866—69; editor of *The Illustrated Christian Weekly*, 1871—76; and since 1876 of *The Christian Union*. Elected pastor of Plymouth Church, Brooklyn, as successor of Henry Ward Beecher, 1889.*" *Schaff-Herzog Encyclopaedia*.

was one, and one only, "to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons."¹⁾ His very name was called Jesus because he was to "save his people *from their sins*,"²⁾ and true to his mission he says, "The son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost."³⁾ Whatever else may be subsumed under the work of Christ is either of the ways and means included in the purpose, or of the effects and consequences related to Christ's work as the fruit is to the tree; but never another purpose aside of and coordinate with the said one object of his coming. Jesus of Nazareth was not a social reformer for the advancement of the temporal interests of society considered in themselves as distinguished from the spiritual interests of man; the kingdom he came to establish is *in* the world, but in no sense *of* the world, spiritual throughout and invisible. Though the children of God eat and drink, the "kingdom of God *is* not meat and drink, but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost."⁴⁾ Says Luther: "Christ does not so rule in his kingdom that we should under him make money, go to war, grow rich and mighty on earth, all of which temporal kings teach and do. For they must see that peace be maintained in their country, that their subjects may live in quiet and harmony and attend to their business. Christ does not reject and condemn all this; for he too eats and drinks as a guest in this world; but in his kingdom, in which he is lord and king, he does not teach us how we should plow, sow, reap, keep house, save money, wage war, govern, and rule the people and state."⁵⁾ Christianity is a religion with its doctrines, precepts, ordinances, worships, tasks, and duties, and manifold blessings, but not a social order or a political theory intended to supplant other theories of inferior excellence and an order of society less conducive to

1) Gal. 4, 5.

2) Matt. 1, 21,

3) Luke 19, 10.

4) Rom. 14, 17.

5) Works Erl. ed., 2, 199.

the welfare of the individual, the family, and society at large. The church is an absolute monarchy in which the will of the king is the law of the realm, and no one but the fellow citizens with the saints is able and willing to submit to and obey that law, to render unto God the things that are God's.¹⁾ From the things that are God's, the things which are Caesar's must always be carefully distinguished, and a confusion of the two will invariably prove detrimental both to the church and to the state. The state cannot be constituted under principles which are spiritual throughout while the carnal mind is enmity against God and is not and cannot be subject to the law of God,²⁾ and as long as "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him, neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned."³⁾ And, in fact, we are in position to quote Dr. Abbott against Dr. Abbott himself when he says:

"Christ proceeded on the directly opposite assumption. He made almost no attempt to change the social order or the social organism. The system of taxation which prevailed in the Roman empire was abominably unjust. Christ said never a word about taxation. Labor was not only underpaid and ill-paid, but, for the most part, worked with its hands in manacles; but Christ never said a word about slavery. If drinking and drunkenness were not as bad in their forms then as they are now, by reason of the modern use of distilled liquors, then comparatively unknown, drinking habits and animalism, in all its forms were worse in Greece than they have ever been in America; but Christ never leveled his shafts against the liquor trade, or the making of wine. Pharisaism had the prestige of a great hierarchical system. Christ did not strike at the hierarchy and the system; he struck at the Pharisee, not at the ism. He struck at the injustice, not at the form which the injustice took at a particular era, in a particular country, under particular circumstances. He sought to change, not methods, but men. He struck, not at the outward clothing of the wrong, but at the wrong itself. Accordingly, he said almost nothing about social evils, and a great deal about individual sins. In strictness of speech, a nation does not sin. The in-

1) Matt. 22, 21.

2) Rom. 8, 7.

3) 1 Cor. 2, 14.

dividuals who make up the nation are the sinners. Sins are individual, and Christ proceeded on the assumption that, if we can get rid of sin in the individual, we shall get rid of evil in the state; but if we leave the sin in the individual, all social reform will result only in a change in the form of social evil.

“Christ’s method of dealing with social injustice is strikingly illustrated by the history of the abolition of slavery. Leaving the slave in bondage and the master in power, Christianity delivered to them both its twofold message. To the master it said, Give unto your servants that which is just and equal, forbearing threatening, knowing that your Master, also, is in heaven, neither is there respect of persons with Him. To the slave it said, Art thou called, being a servant? care not for it; with goodwill do your service, not with eye-service as men-pleasers, but in singleness of heart, as unto Christ. It thus dignified the slave and honored his toil. Under his teaching, slaves did not count themselves disgraced because they were slaves, nor degraded either by the toil put upon them, or by the unjust punishments often inflicted upon them. Under this teaching the masters came to look upon their slaves as their brethren, to whom they owed far more than the law required of them, far more than self-interest could suggest to them. By this conception of it the whole relationship of master and slave was lifted up and transfigured, as an earthly parable of the relation between man and his God. Schmidt’s ‘History of the Social Results of Early Christianity’ and Lecky’s ‘History of European Morals’ trace the effect of this teaching in the gradual and unrevolutionary abolition of slavery. Says the former:—

“‘Long before Chrysostom had raised his voice in favor of slaves, there had been glorious examples of Christian masters freeing their slaves. The earliest known of these is Hermes, Prefect of Rome under Trajan, who embraced Christianity with his wife, children, and 1,250 slaves. On Easter Day, the day of their baptism, Hermes gave them all freedom, and ample assistance to enable them to gain a livelihood. Shortly afterwards he suffered martyrdom with bishop Alexander, who was the means of his conversion. Another Prefect of Rome, under Diocletian, Chromatius, was celebrated in the church for his zeal and charity. He set free 1,400 slaves, and gave them abundant means of support; he said that those who had God for their Father ought not to be the servants of man. Melania, with the consent of her husband Pinus, gave freedom to 8,000 slaves; Ovinus, a French martyr, to 5,000. These great examples were followed by Christians who were not so rich. In the early part of the fourth cen-

tury three brothers set free their seventy-three slaves. Augustine told the people in one of his homilies that several clerks of the church of Hippo were going to emancipate some slaves they possessed. We cannot doubt that many others did the same, though the historians, struck only with what shows in large proportions, have preserved no account of the less startling facts. Whilst rich pagans directed in their will that the blood of their slaves should be shed in combats in the arena, Christian masters, taught by the church, gave freedom and legacies to their slaves, by their will." pp. 130 ff.—

But there is still another misconception which pervades the entire work before us. The title of the book is "*Christianity and Social Problems*." Now the doctrine of Christianity is properly the *Gospel* of divine grace in Christ Jesus; the soul of Christianity is *faith* in Christ, the savior of mankind; the end and aim of Christianity is the *eternal salvation* of sinners and the glory of God; the signature of Christianity in this world is the *cross of Christ* borne by the followers of Christ. Of all this, however, very little is said in this book. On the other hand we hear of the *Golden Rule*, of Christ's *law* of the family, Christ's *law* of service, Christ's *law* for the settlement of controversies, all of which are not specifically Christian at all, but simply applications of the moral law, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." If this is Christianity, then Christianity might have been essentially what it is without Christ, the Redeemer. But the substitution of the Golden Rule, according to which all men must be damned, for Christianity, by which sinners are saved, is so generally practiced to-day and so pernicious a perversion of the truth, that thousands are thereby deceived into the fatal error of mistaking themselves for Christians while, in fact, they are as truly "without Christ"¹⁾ as any pagan ever was. If Christ were only or chiefly a new law-giver, he could not be the Savior of the transgressors of the law. And that the moral precepts of Christianity are in substance what they are, simply the moral law in-

1) Eph. 2, 12.

scribed in man's heart by the Creator's hand, is ample evidence of the comforting truth that Christ is *not* the author and promulgator of a new, a specifically Christian, law, and that, therefore, his mission must have had a different, a higher import and purpose than what our author would make it when he says: "In his life work he was more than a social reformer,—he was a social revolutionist." p. 19.

There are other things in this book to which we take exception. Thus when the author says of the Jewish people:

"Their sacred books, which constituted their sole literature, required them to live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present life, as a necessary means of realizing the hope of a life to come." p. 2.

Speaking of the Apostles of Christ, he says:

"Instructed in the principles of a new social order, inspired by a new and divine life of faith, hope, and love, the disciples went forth to preach the kingdom of God on earth. Of course they could not believe that they were to establish this future kingdom. . . . It was impossible that they should believe this, and they did not. They believed the Messiah would come again in great glory. They waited and watched for that coming, and grew heartsick because he did not come. Little by little the church abandoned its hope of a world-wide kingdom, drew a line between itself and the world, and applied the teachings of their Lord only to the church. It divided men into two classes, the religious and the secular." p. 25 f.

He thinks that the Jews in the time of Solomon

"knew nothing of the Trinity, the divinity of Christ, atonement, the inspiration of the Bible." p. 147.

According to Dr. Abbott's estimate,

"the difference between the rationalist and the orthodox to-day in their interpretation of Christ seems to be chiefly this: Both look at the image in the mirror; the orthodox says, 'This is the image of God;' the rationalist says, 'This is not the image of God, but God looks exactly like him.'" p. 352. —

The suffering and death of Christ was void of its chief and proper purpose, if the following statements are true:

"Man is God's child, and therefore has supremacy over himself. This is the divine foundation of liberty in State, in Church, in Society,—the doctrine that in man himself is dormant a power

to control himself . . . ; man is God's son, and sonship gives him liberty. . . . Our Goddess of liberty . . . should be the figure of Christ; he holds the torch which illumines the world." p. 364. —

These specimens will suffice to show of what stamp Dr. Abbott's *theology* is, and knowing this, the reader will not be surprised at other neological utterances which he will encounter in the perusal of this, otherwise, highly interesting book. Having for many years made the labor question and other social problems the subject of extensive and continued study, we do not hesitate to say that, as far as the *sociological* scope of the work is concerned, we have found but very few books of superior excellence. With few exceptions, the sociological positions occupied and ably advocated by the author are those of the *materiale* of the moral law in its bearing upon the points taken up for consideration. The following extracts will go to substantiate our judgment.

"The church at Jerusalem is sometimes referred to as having adopted a species of communism because the disciples held property in common. But it was not communism, and it was not, strictly speaking, communistic. For the church did not deny—on the contrary it affirmed—the rights of private property. The members of the church might turn their property into the common stock or not, as they pleased, and might turn in as much or as little as they pleased. The contribution to a common treasury was a wholly voluntary contribution. When Ananias and Sapphira sold a possession and pretended to offer the proceeds of the sale to the church, while they really gave only a part, Peter, in his condemnation of them, affirmed the right of private property, and the recognition of that right by the infant church. 'Whiles it remained,' said he, 'was it not thine own? And after it was sold, was it not in thine own power?' A brotherhood which has a common treasury, and to which any member may contribute all or a part of his property as he pleases, is not, properly speaking, a communistic brotherhood. Such holding of property in common for special purposes is not communism nor communistic, for it does not tend to the doctrine that there is no true right of private property." p. 74 f. —

"Property is a trust. Whatever a man possesses is given to him, but the gift is not absolute; it is a gift in trust. He is to use it for

the benefit of the whole community. He is to consider himself only as a single member of that community. The doctrine that property is a trust is implied in the law, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.' If love means emotional ecstasies, this is not a command to love at all. No man is entranced by his own picture, thrilled by his own loveletters, or desirous to caress himself, to love one's neighbor as one's self is to count one's self one of the community, and treat all as worthy of equal consideration. If it is right to respect a neighbor's property, it is right to respect one's own; but it is not right to have one law for one's self and another for the neighbor. He who loves his neighbor as himself will count his own interests part of the common interests; his rights will be measured in his judgment by the rights of his neighbor. Personal welfare and public welfare will become identified. Egoism and altruism will be cooperative, not conflicting. The doctrine that property is a trust is explicit in the teachings of Christ concerning property. Man is a steward; to different men are given different possessions; each one is to trade with the talents entrusted to him, but all are to give account to the Master in a future day of reckoning. Christ reinforces this truth by showing the wisdom as well as the beauty of beneficence. Even the unjust steward who does not care for his Master's interests, or for those of the tenants, is shrewd enough to seek the tenants' favor by his administration of his Master's estate for the tenants' benefit. The right use of property is one of the tests of the judgment day. The faithful and wise servant is one who sees that his Lord has made him ruler in order that he may give to the servants of the household meat in due season. Not skill to acquire, but skill to bestow, is evidence of wisdom. The man who, when his barns are full to bursting, purposes to build greater barns for more grain, and whom the world calls shrewd and prosperous, Christ calls Fool! For such a man knows only how to accumulate, not how to distribute. . . . This is Christ's law of ownership. Property is a trust. Every man who has property is a trustee. Whether it is one dollar or a hundred and fifty million dollars, in no way affects the nature of the responsibility. Any man who uses his property, or any part of his property, for himself alone is guilty of a breach of trust. He is a defaulter before God. For his defalcation he must at the last give account. It will not be enough that he has earned the money honestly; nor that he has not used it oppressively; nor that he has given certain portions of it—a tenth, for example—in what he calls benevolence. It is not his to use. To the affirmation, 'What's mine 's mine,' the answer of Christ is, 'It is not.' No man owns anything. At the last every man must meet the question, 'How have

you administered the trust?' If he is wise he will be asking himself this question day by day. . . .

It does not follow that all property is to be held in common and administered in common, but it does follow that any man who controls any part of his property, whether it has come from the soil or from natural forces, or from public highways, or from what he calls private enterprise, has taken it from the hands of God, and is to administer it in trust for humanity. That is the doctrine of Christianity. It leaves to the people individual enterprise; it contemplates and intends variations of wealth and of condition; but it maintains this fundamental principle: That every man is a trustee, and every man must account for the administration of his trust.

He is a trustee, first of all, for his own family. Whatever money comes to us we are to hold in trust, first, for our own household, not for luxury, which enervates and destroys, but for education, culture, development. We have not only a right, but a duty, to make provision for the manhood of our boys and the womanhood of our girls.

Next, we are trustees for those who are engaged with us in industrial life. A writer in the 'Forum' a few years ago expressed the following judgment:—

'I admit—no, I assert—the demands of charity on every human being, but charity and business are and forever ought to be divorced. An employer is under no more financial obligation to his workmen after he has paid their current wages than they are to him, or to a passerby on the street whom they never saw.'

I believe that is an unchristian heresy. Every man who has workingmen in his employ is a trustee for them. He and they are in a true sense partners engaged in a common enterprise. He owes them an obligation which wages do not meet. The first duty of an employer to his employed is the duty of loyalty. When a ship founders in storm, the captain is not the first to abandon her, leaving the crew to go down. When a regiment is in peril in battle, the colonel does not flee and leave the regiment to go under the sod. When the Christians in Armenia are trembling in fear of martyrdom, the missionaries do not follow the advice given to them and flee to the coast for protection. They stay with their native Christian brethren so long as staying can be of any possible service. And the time will come when every merchant and every manufacturer will follow the example which is now set by many a merchant and many a manufacturer, and will stand by his crew in stormy times.

Lastly, there is the trust held by men of wealth for the benefit of the entire community." pp. 81 ff.

"In all work hand and brain must cooperate. Labor is not all hand-labor. An American humorist has said with great truth, 'In the sweat of thy brow shalt thou eat bread, but some men sweat outside and some inside.' The brain has need of the hand, and the hand of the brain. Both are entitled to their share of the world's products, but this one fundamental truth remains: the world has just so much as we put into it, no more. If we do not by our consecrated use of hand or head or heart, by our personal activity or our wise direction of the activity of others, by our serving or our suffering, endeavor to add to the world's wealth—material, intellectual, or spiritual—at least as much as we have taken out of it, we belong in the category of the beggars, the thieves, and the gamblers.

The first principle, then, is respect for labor, and respect for each other's labor: respect by the man who works with his brain for the man who works with his hand, and respect by the man who works with his hand for the man who works with his brain—mutual respect. When we have thoroughly learned this one fundamental principle, that to destroy is not honorable and to produce is, that the glory of the nation lies in its production, that the glory of life lies in adding to the wealth of life,—its material, its intellectual, its spiritual wealth,—we shall have learned one great underlying lesson. Until we have learned this all other learning is in vain, for this is the foundation. The greatest of all is the servant of all. We believe this in the church: the minister is the servant of the congregation. We believe in politics: the President is the servant of the people. We shall not get to the Christian basis of industry until we come to recognize in industry also that there is no such thing as independence, and that the greatest and the richest and the strongest is great only as he is the servant of the weak and the poor." p. 177 f.

"The final authority in the normal family is the husband: he is the head of the household. What is the alternative? Either there is a rift in the family, in one department the wife supreme, in the other department the husband supreme, neither entering into the other's department,—then there is not a unit, not these twain one flesh, not a single person with one life, one will, one heart, but a divided household, divided at the very foundation; or there is a perpetual struggle going on between the husband and the wife, she endeavoring to get control by cunning, he endeavoring to get control by force; she generally getting the better of it, for cunning habitually gets the better of force,—then the family is a perpetual battlefield. Or else the divine order is reversed, and the wife is the head of the household,—a condition which does not need any comment.

The husband and wife may wisely divide between them, by a common consent, the responsibilities of the household; that does not affect the autocracy. In some families, through invalidism, intellectual or physical or moral, or all three combined, the husband cannot be at the head and the wife must be, usually to the discomfort of both. But that is not a normal household. The normal, the divine order, is the order in which the husband is the head of the household, and the household is an autocracy.

"This is not to affirm that man is superior to woman. That has often been affirmed; I repudiate it with indignation. It is not to affirm that the husband is superior to the wife. That has been affirmed; I repudiate it no less indignantly. There is no question of superiority or inferiority. The question is of headship, not of superiority. An inferior individual may be a superior officer. During the Vicksburg campaign Grant was the greater general, but Halleck was the superior officer. The President of the United States is the head of the nation, but he is not necessarily the greatest man in the nation. I understand then, that Christ's law of the household, as interpreted and applied by Paul, involves these two laws: First, Wives, submit to your husbands; second, Husbands, love your wives, as Christ loved you and gave himself for you. In the poems and stories and sermons, the women are eulogized as cross-bearers. It is small credit to husbands that literature always puts the crosses on the wives. It is the men who ought to be the cross-bearers.

"This does no dishonor to women. It is honoring her. It does not deprive her of her rights. It confers upon her the rights which paganism takes away. For, in the order of nature, man is the soldier. It is the man who is to shoulder the musket and go forth to battle to protect the wife. If bread is to be got by hard toil, it is the man who is to subdue nature, and get the bread for his wife. It is not a woman's right to harness herself with the ox and plow in the fields, as women do in some countries. It is the man who is to do the work and take the responsibilities, that woman may minister to love and life. Responsibility and authority are always commensurate. An undefined authority means an undefined responsibility, of all responsibilities the hardest to bear. . . . I cannot look with enthusiasm upon the new era in which women are rushing into every kind of employment, and lowering the wages of men by doing men's work. I would not close the door against them, nor shut them out from any vocation; I would give them the largest liberty. But men, with their strong arms, ought to fight life's battle and win life's bread, and leave the women free from the burden of bread-winning and

battling, that they may minister to the higher life of faith and hope and love. Nor will our industrial situation be what it ought to be, until every faithful husband and father can earn enough for his wife and children, without calling them to labor by his side in the mine, the mill, the shop, or the office.

"In the third place, since marriage is not a civil contract, and the husband and wife are not co-equal partners in a common enterprise, marriage is not dissolvable at the pleasure of the parties to it. The common argument for such dissolution is very simple and easily stated. 'Why should those remain bound together by law whose hearts are not bound together by love? Why should a woman remain in marital bondage to a man when she does not love and perhaps cannot even respect him? Marriage is the union of souls; if the souls are not united the marriage is dissolved.' Such is the argument for freedom of divorce. Such is not Christ's view of either marriage or divorce. Marriage is not a union of souls: it is the mating of two persons in one flesh. Two souls may be joined, and yet there be no marriage; marriage there may be, and yet no union of souls. Marriage is the creation of new earthly relation. For the highest happiness, where the life is one the souls should be one; but it is the unity of the lives, not of the souls, which constitutes marriage. Hence marriage ceases at death, though spiritual union does not. Hence, too, marriage is not dissoluble because love is dead. The mere cessation of sympathy no more annuls marriage than it annuls any other family relation. It is very desirable that the son should reverence the father, and that the father should sympathize with the son. But the son does not cease to be a son because the father is unworthy of reverence, nor does the father cease to be father because he is unable to sympathize with his son. So it is of the utmost moment that the husband and wife love and honor each other, but they do not cease to be husband and wife because they cannot love and honor. Love and honor make the result of the marriage blessed, but they do not constitute the relation.

"And as Christ does not accept the definition of marriage as a 'union of souls,' so neither does he accept incompatibility of temper as a ground of divorce. His words on this subject are as explicit as any in his teachings: 'Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery; and whoso marrieth her which is put away committeth adultery.'...

"The remedy for connubial infelicities is not flying from them. The remedy for an ill is not flying from it. The remedy for infelicities in the pastorate is not short pastorates. It is more patience by the

pastor towards the church, and more patience by the church toward the pastor. The remedy for the friction which enters into our households is not separation; it is closer union. I have sometimes heard the wife say after a funeral, 'He never spoke a cross word,' and have blessed the widow's short memory. A life without a cross word would be a miracle of self-restraint. There are very few married couples in which each does not have to exercise patience with the other. The spirit which produces separation is the spirit that suffers and is cross, that seeketh its own, — the spirit of suspicion, not trust; of discouragement, not hope, — the spirit that seeks to escape from life's burdens, not that beareth all things, trusteth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things; the love which counts another's fault as his burden, and bears it for him; the love which is never suspicious, but trusting and confiding, and, when confidence is wronged and trust is no longer possible, still hopes: and, when hope long deferred makes the heart sick, still endures; a love like the love of Christ, who, having loved his own, loved them unto the end." pp. 148 ff.

All this is, sociologically considered, delightful reading, and social reformers will do well to heed and ponder what Dr. Abbott here says in pointing out the direction in which the solution of the social problems of the day may be, though not ultimately and definitely, yet in a measure approximately, solved and existing difficulties may be, though not in all, yet in many cases satisfactorily adjusted. We must, however, once more emphasize that we cannot allow these and similar recommendations to pose as specifically Christian. They are even far from going the full length of the moral law, which demands that all our acts should be prompted by the fear and love of God and performed in filial obedience to his will, not because of their expediency or conduciveness to our temporal welfare and the improved condition of society. Society, at large, or the State, which is society organized within a given territory under national and municipal laws and a government with legislative, judicial, and executive functions, can consistently deal only with the *materiale* of the moral law, and with that only as far as it relates to the temporal affairs of the community

and its individual members, while it must leave the entire *formale*, according to which the law is the exhibition of the holy will of God, and also the *materiale* of the First Table, to the *religious* life of men and to the religious community, the Church. Civil laws are reasonable and expedient only as far as they can be generally enforced. But the love of God and man can never be enforced and should, therefore, never enter into civil legislation. The love of God and man is the daughter of faith and, like faith itself, can be engendered only by the Gospel. And the Gospel is not an aggregate of social principles, but a means of grace, and was not entrusted to the State, but to the Church, by him who has ordained that civil government should bear the sword. However important the social problems dealt with in Dr. Abbott's book may be, the thorough theoretical and practical separation of Church and State is of greater importance for the welfare of both Church and State.

A. G.

St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen. By W. M. Ramsay, D. C. L. LL. D. Professor of Humanity, Aberdeen, etc. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. London, Hodder & Stoughton. 1896. XVI and 394 pp. 8vo with a map. Price \$3.00.

The author of this book is not a theologian; but St. Paul was, and so was St. Luke; and even when a lawyer at the hand of St. Luke "the historian" exhibits "St. Paul the traveller and the Roman citizen," his work ought to be profitable reading for theologians and a proper subject for "theological review." In fact, there is more of acceptable historical theology in Dr. Ramsay's book than in many works of modern Doctors of Divinity, and as a commentary to the *Acts of the Apostles* this book ranks high above the productions of the Tuebingen school of theologians who would have us put down the author of the

Acts as a second or third rate writer of historical romance of a post-apostolic age and bent upon deceiving his readers by hiding away the "antagonism between the Petrine and the Pauline types of Christianity." We sincerely regret to find Dr. Ramsay, too, on the wrong side of the line inasmuch as Luke is to him simply a human author, whom he does not except when he says, "We may admit the possibility that a first-century historian has made errors."¹) But we are, on the other hand, delighted to see the so-called historical criticism of so-called theologians put to shame by a writer who, while perhaps no more a theologian than they are, is vastly their superior as a historian and a critic. He demonstrates that the *Acts* are not a crazy quilt of various materials variously patched, but a masterpiece of historical composition which can be followed from beginning to end without let or hindrance by internal inconsistencies or real disagreement with contemporaneous writings. The book is not chiefly critical; but we cannot withhold from our readers the following specimen of the author's manner of handling critical questions.

"7. PAUL'S ACTION ON THE SHIP.²) The account of the voyage as a whole is commonly accepted by critics as the most trustworthy part of the *Acts* and as 'one of the most instructive documents for the knowledge of ancient seamanship' (Holtzmann on XXVII 4, p. 421). But in it many critics detect the style of a later hand, the supposed second-century writer that made the work out of good and early documents, and addressed his compilation to Theophilus. Many hold that this writer inserted vv. 21—26, and some assign to him also vv. 33—35; because the character there attributed to Paul is quite different from his character in the genuine old document, especially vv. 10 and 31: in the original parts Paul is represented as a simple passenger, cautious to a degree, suffering from hunger, apprehensive of the future, keenly alive to prospective danger, and anxious to provide against it: on the other hand, in vv. 21—26 he knows that their safety is assured; he speaks as the prophet, not the anxious passenger; he occupies a position apart from, and on a higher plane than human.

1) p. 16.

2) *Acts* XVII.

This is a fair hypothesis, and deserves fair and dispassionate consideration; no one whose mind is not already definitely made up on all questions can pass it by; and only those who feel that they understand the entire narrative in every turn and phrase and allusion would willingly pass it by, for every real student knows how frequently his knowledge is increased by changing his point of view.

We may at once grant that the narrative would go on without any obvious awkwardness if 21—26 were omitted, which is of course true of many a paragraph describing some special incident in a historical work.

But it is half-hearted and useless to cut out 21—26 as an interpolation without cutting out 33—38; there, too, Paul is represented as the prophet and the consoler on a higher plane, though he is also the mere passenger suffering from hunger, and alive to the fact that the safety of all depends on their taking food and being fit for active exertion in the morning. Some critics go so far as to cut out vv. 33—35. But if they are accepted, I fail to see any reason for rejecting 21—26; these two passages are so closely akin in purport and bearing on the context that they must go together; and all the mischief attributed to 21—26 as placing Paul on a higher plane is done in 33—35.

Further the excision of 21—26 would cut away a vital part of the narrative. (1) These verses contain the additional fact, natural in itself and assumed in v. 34 as already known, that the crew and passengers were starving and weak. (2) They fit well into the context for they follow naturally after the spiritlessness described in v. 20, and Paul begins by claiming attention on the ground of his former advice (advice that is accepted by the critics as genuine because it is different in tone from the supposed interpolation). 'In former circumstances' says he, 'I gave you different, but salutary advice, which to your cost you disregarded; listen to me now when I tell you that you shall escape.' The method of escape, the only method that a sailor could believe to be probable, is added as a concluding encouragement.

But let us cut out every verse that puts Paul on a higher plane, and observe the narrative that would result: Paul twice comes forward with advice that is cautiously prudent, and shows keen regard to the chance of safety. If that is all the character he displayed throughout the voyage, why do we study the man and his fate? All experience shows that in such a situation there is often found some one to encourage the rest; and, if Paul had not been the man to comfort and cheer his despairing shipmates, he would never have

impressed himself on history or made himself an interest to all succeeding time. The world's history stamps the interpolation-theory here as false.

Moreover, the letters of Paul put before us a totally different character from this prudent calculator of chances. The Paul of Acts XXVII is the Paul of the Epistles: the Paul who remains on the interpolation-theory could never have written the Epistles.

Finally, the reason why the historian dwells at such length on the voyage lies mainly in vv. 21—26 and 33—38. In the voyage he pictures Paul on a higher plane than common men, advising more skillfully than the skilled mariners, maintaining hope and courage when all were in despair, and breathing his hope and courage into others, playing the part of a true Roman in a Roman ship, looked up to even by the centurion, and in his single self the saviour of the lives of all. But the interpolation-theory would cut out the centre of the picture.

There remains no reason to reject vv. 21—26 which I can discover, except that it introduces the superhuman element. That is an argument to which I have no reply. It is quite a tenable position in the present stage of science and knowledge to maintain that every narrative which contains elements of the marvelous must be an un-historical and untrustworthy narrative. But let us have the plain and honest reasons: those who defend that perfectly fair position should not try to throw in front of it as outworks flimsy and uncritical reasons, which cannot satisfy for a moment any one that has not his mind made up beforehand on that fundamental premise. But the superhuman element is inextricably involved in this book: you cannot cut it out by any critical process that will bear scrutiny. You must accept all or leave all." p. 336 ff.

While this is not a theological way of dealing with the matter in hand, it shows that St. Luke has no reason, and our negative critics have every reason, to fear sober historical criticism. Faith will forever receive the *Acts* as the word of God. Reason is capable of recognizing a gem of historical literature, where unsound minds have surmised a mass of ill-assorted scraps. And "probably," says Dr. Ramsay, "there will always be those who prefer the scraps."¹)

A. G.

1) p. 204.

The Literary Study of the Bible; an account of the leading forms of Literature represented in the Sacred Writings.

Intended for English readers by Richard G. Moulton, M. A. (Cambr.) Ph. D. (Penna.), Professor of Literature in the University of Chicago, Late University Extension Lecturer (Cambridge and London). Boston U. S. A.: D. C. Heath & Co. London: Isbister & Co., Limited. 1896. XII and 533 pp. 8vo; price \$2.00. —

This is a peculiar book. That the author has *searched the Scriptures*, is evident on every page; that *in them he thought he had eternal life*, appears nowhere. The Bible is not here a Paradise for sweet communion with God, or a storehouse of spiritual blessings, but a botanical garden with fine specimens carefully labeled, or a museum of articles of vertu arranged in glass cases. Now we would by no means deny that a botanical garden well kept and a museum of objects well selected and arranged may prove very instructive and highly interesting and entertaining, especially to the educated visitor. Thus also we hold that a well trained reader will derive some measure of valuable information from a careful perusal of the volume before us. He will be led to a better understanding of many of the sacred texts here analyzed or grouped together after the author's method, and to an increased enjoyment of many of the beauties in which the Scriptures abound. We say this although we are not unmindful of the fact that the author has in the preparation of his work drawn quite largely on his imagination, a practice which he shares with the "higher critics," of whom he is a professed admirer.¹⁾ For these and other reasons we can recommend the book to such only as "by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil." As a fair specimen of Dr. Moulton's workmanship we give the following "literary" analysis and arrangement of the CXVIII Psalm.

1) pp. IV. X.

"In the psalm the sequence of verses clearly suggests a solo and two distinct choruses. At the beginning the Worshipper is approaching the Temple with an Escort of Friends; later on a second chorus of Priests must be added.

PSALM CXVIII.

The Worshipper and his Escort approach the Temple.

Tutti. O give thanks unto the LORD; for he is good:
For his mercy endureth for ever.

Worshipper. Let Israel now say—

Escort. That his mercy endureth for ever.

Worshipper. Let the house of Aaron now say—

Escort. That his mercy endureth for ever.

Worshipper. Let now them that fear the LORD say—

Escort. That his mercy endureth for ever.

Worshipper. Out of my distress I called upon the LORD:
The LORD answered me, and set me in a large place.
The LORD is on my side; I will not fear:
What can man do unto me?
The LORD is on my side among them that help me:
Therefore shall I see my desire upon them that hate me.

Escort. It is better to trust in the LORD
Than to put confidence in man;
It is better to trust in the LORD
Than to put confidence in princes.

Worshipper. All nations compassed me about:

Escort. In the name of the LORD I will cut them off!

Worshipper. They compassed me about;

Yea, they compassed me about:

Escort. In the name of the LORD I will cut them off!

Worshipper. They compassed me about like bees;

They are quenched as the fire of thorns:

Escort. In the name of the LORD I will cut them off!

Worshipper. Thou didst thrust sore at me that I might fall:
But the LORD helped me.
The LORD is my strength and song;
And he is become my salvation.

A voice of rejoicing and salvation is in the tents of the righteous:

The right hand of the LORD doeth valiantly.

Escort. The right hand of the LORD is exalted:

The right hand of the LORD doeth valiantly.

Worshipper. I shall not die, but live,

And declare the works of the LORD.

The LORD has chastened me sore:

But he hath not given me over unto death.

Open to me the gates of righteousness:

I will enter into them,

I will give thanks unto the LORD.

The Temple gates open and disclose a Chorus of Priests.

Priests. This is the Gate of the LORD:

The righteous shall enter into it.

Worshipper. I will give thanks unto thee, for thou hast answered me

And art become my salvation.

The stone which the builders rejected

Is become the head of the corner.

Escort. This is the LORD's doing;

It is marvellous in our eyes.

This is the day which the LORD hath made;

We will rejoice and be glad in it.

Save now, we beseech thee, o LORD:

O LORD, we beseech thee, send now prosperity.

The Worshipper enters the Temple: the Escort prepare to retire.

Priests (to the Worshipper).

Blessed be he that entereth in the name of the LORD!

(to the Escort, retiring).

We have blessed you out of the house of the LORD!

Priests. The LORD is God, and hath given us light:

Bind the sacrifice with cords, even unto the horns of the altar.

Worshipper. Thou art my God, and I will give thanks unto thee:

Thou art my God, I will exalt thee.

Tutti. O give thanks unto the LORD; for he is good:

For his mercy endureth for ever."

A. G.

Country Sermons on Free Texts, by F. Kuegele, a Lutheran Country Parson.

Two years ago a volume appeared which bore this title and contained thirty-eight sermons for the Sundays and festivals of the church year from the first Sunday in Advent to Pentecost. The book was welcomed by many as it deserved to be, and the author was encouraged to continue his work and publish a second volume containing sermons on the rest of the Sundays in the church calendar and, perhaps, an appendix of occasional sermons and addresses. We are pleased to announce that such encouragement has not been in vain. Advance sheets of a part of the desired second volume of the "*Country Sermons*," comprising 160 pages and eighteen sermons, have been forwarded to us by the publisher. From the specimens before us we see that the volume now in course of publication will be equally deserving of cordial recommendation as the first part of what will soon be a complete Postil of Lutheran sermons has proved to be.

A. G.

In our next issue we shall acquaint our readers with a work which together with another volume mentioned in these pages arrived when nearly all the space at our disposal in the present issue was already occupied. It is *Buddhism, its History and Literature*, by T. W. Rhys Davids, LL. D. Ph. D., published by G. P. Putnam's Sons.

The Pulpit.

SIXTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

TEXT: MATTHEW 5, 20—26.

During the reading of our text, the thought may have occurred to some of you: why is it that we find Christ devoting so much time to the Law, or, rather, to promulgating laws which to many seemed new and strange? Is Christ to be viewed in the light of a new lawgiver after Moses?

Surely such a conception of the Savior robs the name of Jesus, robs it of that which makes it sweet in the sinner's ear. Then we should indeed have to look upon Him as our father Luther was taught to view Him by his Romish teachers; namely, as the stern Judge who gauges all things according to the standard of God's Law. Then sinful mortals would indeed be constrained to flee from Him just as the Children of Israel fled from the mountain when the Lord thundered forth His Law; just as they fled from the face of Moses himself after he appeared from Sinai. As a lawgiver, issuing commands which no man can fulfil, He loses His character of Savior who says to men disquieted and afflicted by the Law of Moses: "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy-laden, and I will give you rest." It cannot be, then, that Christ is a new lawgiver or, at least, one who sharpened the exactions of the Mosaic Law. He himself disclaims coming to destroy the Law or to teach one that is new. "I am come to fulfil," says He.

But what can be His purpose in interpreting the Law of Moses and in showing the people how the Pharisees, the scribes, and the lawyers had put a wrong construction upon it? Why is He so greatly concerned about this, that man should have the correct understanding of this Law?

No one will deny that it is Christ who has shown us the true sense and import of this Law in all it embraces. What His purpose is in so doing, our text may help us to discover. Just as it is He, who teaches us the true meaning of the Law, so it is He who would show us the true use of the Law. Upon the basis of our text let us discuss

THE THREEFOLD USE OF THE LAW.

- I. As a curb;*
- II. As a mirror;*
- III. As a rule.*

I.

"The imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth" (Gen. 8, 21) was the verdict which God was obliged to pass upon the whole human family, and Jesus continues in the same strain when He says: "For out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murder, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies." The heart of man or his innermost nature is, therefore, as some one has well expressed it, "a nest of vipers where all these hideous crimes lie incipient, awaiting but an opportunity to break forth into the light of day, a tinder-box of all shames, needing but the spark of temptation and occasion to flame up and burst forth into fiery passions." Were this evil nature, inherent in every man, allowed to have full sway, language would fail to describe the fearful deluge of open sin and iniquity that would drown the world. There are indeed men, anarchists and communists of all shades and opinions, who would do away with all restraint that has been put upon man and allow him to give free rein to all his passions, thinking thus to make every person infinitely happy. A doctrine fraught with more terrible results for humanity could not be imagined. Such a course would amount to instituting hell upon earth and in the eternal destruction of almost every soul. Such doctrine is not of God whose Law is to be a curb, a check to man's evil nature.

The Pharisee mentioned in our text led to all appearances an honorable life, observing, for instance, the injunction, "thou shalt not kill," most diligently and faithfully, in so far as this command formed part of the code of laws regulating external conduct. This strict observing of the Law was characteristic of the Pharisees, for they were most punctilious in keeping the letter of the Law together with the injunctions of the elders thought to be based thereon. They consequently acquired a great reputation for holiness. In fact, the very name "Pharisee" means "one that is separate from," since they regarded themselves and were looked upon by others as being separate from the common herd, from the ordinary run of people who made no special pretensions to holiness. Many of them, as we have learned to know, were hypocrites; none of them, while they remained members of this sect, found anything congenial to their taste in the doctrine of Christ.

It must be noticed that Christ does not condemn in itself this external observance of the Law. He does not say: "But I say unto you: Whosoever shall kill, shall *not* be in danger of the judgment." He allows the Law to stand: "Whosoever shall kill, shall be in danger of judgment," and intimates that those who obey this Law insofar as it prohibits the actual deed of murder, have, indeed, a kind of righteousness. Of the Pharisees who understood the Law in this way He speaks when He says to His disciples: "Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, etc." He does indeed apply the term "righteousness" to their observance of the Law, although, of course, this righteousness was not sufficient for the purpose for which they sought it.

There are many to-day who obey God's Law as did the Pharisees of old and thus acquire a kind of righteousness. It is the will of God that it should be so and His Law was given that it might be in the world acting as a curb upon man's evil inclinations. Thus the Law: "Thou shalt not

kill," together with the penalty attached thereto: "Who-soever shall kill shall be in danger of judgment," keeps many a man from giving vent in deed to his anger, to his hatred, to the desire for vengeance that rages in his heart. In conformity with the purpose of God this Law is found written in the statute-books or forming part of the unwritten right of all nations. Therefore, also, is it found engraven upon the hearts of even unbelievers, so that the accusation of "thou shalt not kill" voiced by his conscience within him has driven many a murderer to seek to still this tormenting accuser either by voluntarily surrendering himself to punishment, or by inflicting the death penalty upon himself. According to the purpose of God it is, therefore, right and proper that those who are in authority should sit in judgment, pass sentence, and execute wrath upon those who break this Law.

Thus we see that God's Law is in force and power against even unbelievers, binding them to lead lives honorable in the sight of man if they would avoid falling into the hands of God's ministers, the government, that executes wrath upon those who do evil, that is, who break the Law in outward deed. Thus God has interposed His Law as an effective curb keeping in restraint the evil will of man.

If it is required of the unregenerate worldling that he in so far do the will of God, what must be said of those who call themselves Christians and yet in many ways show their contempt for the Law of God by refusing to obey the laws of the government under which they live, by evading the penalties while making use of unlawful means to satisfy their greed, gratify their hatred, and still their desire for revenge? Their righteousness instead of being *better* is *worse* than that of the scribes and Pharisees! Woe unto them!

II.

That with this application of the Law its use is not exhausted, our text leads us to see in that the Law is held

up as a *mirror*. To make use of the Law in this way, as the text directs, man must have more than a mere superficial knowledge of the same. He who does not penetrate into its inner meaning and then makes use of this Law as the mirror in which to view himself and all his deeds, will become a selfsatisfied and selfrighteous Pharisee when he finds that outwardly he has lead an honorable life. He will never view himself in this mirror as he really is and will not see that he is a child of wrath who is in danger of judgment and of hellfire. Such was the case with the scribes and Pharisees. With their scant, shallow knowledge of the Law they undertook to view themselves therein in order to form an estimate of themselves and their works. Naturally they were well satisfied with the outcome, for they saw in themselves paragons of holiness and were esteemed such by the people. Hence they fell into the sin of selfrighteousness and were pointed out by Christ as men whose holiness fell far short of making them children of the kingdom of heaven. The righteousness of those who would be heirs of the kingdom must exceed, surpass, go farther than that of the scribes and Pharisees, and the mirror in which they view themselves must be truer and clearer than that used by these deluded men.

The clearer and more highly polished the mirror, the better will it show every blemish in the face of the beholder. When then this mirror in which man is to view himself is used, it must be bright and clear. The deep, spiritual meaning of the Law must be laid bare as Christ does here for His disciples, would man view in the same the real worth of his deeds, words, and thoughts. Christ, therefore, shows His disciples that this Law damns not only every deed that is contrary to it, but even every word, yea every thought that is a transgression thereof. Its penalty will be paid not only by the red-handed murderer, but whosoever is angry with his brother without cause shall be in danger of judgment; whosoever shall say to his brother

"Raca," that is, unjustly and angrily belittle and bemean him, shall be in danger of the council, that is, of punishment; whosoever shall say "Thou fool," angrily curse and condemn his brother, shall be in danger of hellfire; yea even he who thinks that he can worship God by bringing his gifts to the altar, although his brother hath something against him, will find that his gift is an abomination unto the Lord. Therefore, he who has the mirror of the Law as the Lord God made it, who understands it and its requirements as Christ exhibits them in our text, will find that he can never render that righteousness which is better than the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, sufficient unto entering into the kingdom of God. He then feels that it is indeed the purpose of God to judge every thought and word according to the Law and to condemn eternally those who cannot stand before His searching judgment; that he, sinner as he now knows himself to be, can never enter the kingdom of heaven, but must be banished into the pit of hell, though perchance he has not with deed of hand broken the Law. He realizes then that the judge will hand him over to the officer, and he will be cast into prison to remain forever, since never can he pay the debt of obedience of which he has robbed God. To such a man the Law is indeed a mirror showing him all the hideous blemishes that make his soul hateful in the sight of God. Far from causing him to be lifted up with selfrighteousness and pride, it humbles him in the dust before the Holy God and crushes him under the contemplation of the impending doom. This is what the apostle means when he says, Rom. 3, 20.: "By the law is the knowledge of sin."

It is in this way that the heart of man is made ready to receive the Gospel. When the hard heart has been bruised by the hammer of the Law, then the balm of Gilead, the Gospel, heals the wounds. When man has been brought to see that all his righteousnesses are nothing more than filthy rags he rejoices to receive the spotless robe of righteousness

which the Savior holds out to him. And in order that this result may be brought about the Law must be diligently applied as a mirror in our homes, in our churches, and in our schools. With a view to bringing about such an effect Christ held up this Law to the Pharisees and to the people around Him.

But unto the disciples, also, He spake, showing that even Christians have use for the Law as a mirror. For Christians should time and again view themselves in this perfect mirror of the Law, in order that they may ever be mindful of how in themselves they can do nothing that is perfect without blemish. Satan never leaves off tempting the best of God's children and strives to entangle them in the sin of selfrighteousness and to lull them into the sleep of security. But if the Christian will ever have the Law of the Lord before his eyes he will never forget what a lost and abandoned and wretched sinner he was before the grace of God found him and made him what he is; he will ever see that even now while he is a disciple of Christ, he must humbly acknowledge before his Father in heaven that in many things he does still err and is far from having reached that perfection for which he should strive. Thus will all thoughts of pride be kept down and he will cling more closely to his only Savior with a believing heart filled with gratitude for that righteousness which covers up all his shortcomings. Undismayed by repeated failures to do the perfect will of God he will strive again and anew with the power that grace provides. And in this striving the Law, which is the revealed will of his God, serves to direct him and is his rule of life.

III.

True it is, no man can enter into the kingdom of heaven by virtue of his own righteousness. When the Savior says: "Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no wise enter into

the kingdom of heaven," He in no wise intimates that it lies within the power of any man to acquire this necessary righteousness. All he says is, that they who do enter into the kingdom of heaven must have a righteousness transcending that of the scribes and Pharisees. As to how this is obtained He says not a word. But the way in which He describes this righteousness must lead every one to see that it is beyond the power of man to acquire it for himself. As Christians we know that all our hope is based upon the holiness of the Savior which has become ours by faith. The imputing of a righteousness foreign to man is what distinguishes our most holy Christian religion from all religions falsely so called. Christians appear before their God clad in the snow white garb of Christ's holiness. For them He fulfilled the Law, every jot and tittle of it.

This truth, however, cannot make the Christian sluggish in the new obedience. "I will run the way of thy commandments, when thou shalt enlarge my heart" promises David speaking in the name of all believers. God has enlarged the heart of the Christian, that is, made it large, dilated it with joy by making known unto it the Gospel tidings of salvation; and the heart thus made glad is filled with gratitude and love towards God and is eager to run the way of His commandments, to do His will. As a loving and obedient child delights to do the will of a loving father so as to earn from him a smile of approval, so is the loving child of the kind Father in heaven filled with burning zeal to do His will. And just as the child can please its father best by hearkening unto his words and obeying them, so the Son of God can please His Father best by giving ear unto His Word and Law, to do the same. The Savior indicates in our text that Christians evince their love towards God; for He puts it down as a self-evident duty that they bring their gifts to the altar. Moreover, a lesson taught in the whole text is this, that Christians should show their love towards their neighbor in thought, word, and

deed. There are, then, ways in which the believer can do the will of his Father both towards his God and towards his neighbor. But he must not suppose that it has been left for him to decide as to how he can please God. It has not been left to him to serve God according to his whims and fancies. Many have thought themselves the judges and arbiters in this matter and have set up their own forms of good works. The one fondly imagines that he is doing the perfect will of God by taking the vows of obedience to the Church, of chastity, of poverty, while another makes much of abstaining from certain meats and drinks, not thinking for a moment that unto them apply the words of Christ, the Son of God: "In vain do they worship me teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." Surely, it is the Lord who must say what is right and well-pleasing in His sight. Man may reason: "Bringing gifts to His altar is well-pleasing to the Lord, and, therefore, it matters little or nothing whether when I bring my offering my heart is reconciled to my brother." But the Savior, who knows the mind of God, shows that such bringing of gifts even to the altar of the Lord is an abomination in His eyes, and that such a course, far from meeting with the approval of Him for whom these offerings are ostensibly made, merits nothing but His wrath and condemnation.

Therefore, would Christians really do the will of God and feel assured that they are doing that which is acceptable in His sight, they must not trust to their own feelings and opinions, but must hold solely to the will of God as revealed in His Word and Law. Thus the Law becomes their rule of life according to which they strive to act and to live, conscious that in thus striving they are really endeavoring to render obedience to their kind Father in heaven to do His will. Of course, the more earnestly a Christian strives and the more carefully he keeps watch over every thought, word, and deed, in order to see whether all his thinking and speaking and doing conform to the Law of the

Lord, the more sensible will he become of the fact that even his best endeavors fall far short of the perfect will of God and the more will he find cause to take comfort in the perfect obedience to the Law rendered by Him who came to fulfil the same. In that soul there will ever be a grateful appreciation of the love and merit of that One who paid for him and for every sinner the uttermost farthing.

Guided by our text we have directed our attention to the threefold use of the Law, than which Scripture knows no other. The vanity of all those sectarians who imagine that by their very imperfect and partial observance of the Law God is rendered somewhat propitious or that thereby the work of salvation is in a measure accomplished, needs no further refutation. Rank insanity, in the light of our text, is the doctrine of perfect holiness; that is, the delusion that Christians may attain to such a degree of perfection in this life that they fulfil the Law completely.—To us this revealed will of God is a curb upon the godless world, a mirror in which to view our sins and imperfections, a rule of life according to which to direct our steps in order, as loving children, to do the will of our Father in heaven. May we be diligent in using this, God's Law, showing our love towards God, making known our love towards our fellows, shining as bright examples of Christian virtue, until from this life's frailty we shall be saints made perfect in heaven above. Amen.

G. A. R.

